The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1919 No. 2799

The Week

THE Berne conferences are over, the dreaded meeting of Socialists and labor men from the opposing countries has taken place, and apparently Allied statesmen are drawing a long breath and hoping that they may have secured an internationally organized ally against Bolshevism. The gathering was organized as two distinct conferences, possibly with the vain hope of getting the coy American Federation of Labor to join in the trade-union conference, which met apart from the international Socialist conference. The two bodies seem, however, to have worked in the closest touch. In spite of the endeavors of Vandervelde and Anseele, the Belgian Socialists could not bring themselves to meet the Germans; on the other hand the Swiss Socialists refused to participate because they considered the whole affair not sufficiently radical. The delegates of the American Socialist party were absent, being unable, it is said, to secure the necessary French and British visés for their long delayed passports. Twenty-five countries were represented, however, and many of the best known leaders were present. The hot discussion of responsibility for the war, instead of wrecking the Socialist conference, seems to have served to blow off steam; the question was shelved and German Majority Socialists were formally admitted to participate in the reconstruction of the International. A similar spirit of conciliation seems to have been shown in dealing with Russia. Any international body dealing with political questions must be embarrassed to-day by rival claims and complaints. Despite such difficulties, the Berne meetings seem to have made progress with their main task of elaborating an economic and political programme to urge upon the Paris conference. Above all, they have provided for a continuance by both bodies of the international collaboration now at last resumed. The Socialist International Conference created a permanent committee with headquarters at Amsterdam, charged among other things to call the conference together again shortly; and the International Trade Union Conference simply adjourned to meet again in May.

ANSWERING the queries of Mr. Adamson, the chairman of the Labor party in the House of Commons, Premier Lloyd George has made an authoritative and explicit statement on the Allied policy in Russia. The main points in his address are the following: No proposal has been advanced at the peace conference to recognize the Bolsheviki. The Allies have given the anti-Bolshevist Governments financial support and assistance and have supplied much of their equipment. Were the Allies now to send troops to Russia, the work would fall upon the British and French; for America will send neither men, money, nor material. The Bolshevist machinery in Russia is ruthless and brutal, but there is no doubt about its efficiency, and it is the only machinery there; everybody who has interfered in Russia in the past has come to grief. Notwithstanding the horrors of Bolshevism, there is no use in closing one's eyes to the fact that the military power of the Bolsheviki has grown while both England and Germany were too occupied to attack it, and that it is strong at the present time. While the Premier was unable to disclose the figures that intervention would involve, he declared that after seeing them no sane man would advise the Allies, at the end of five years of war, to undertake the enterprise. He added that there was no idea of recognizing the Bolsheviki, such a course being quite impossible so long as they continued to pursue their present methods. At the same time, he declared that the alternative of allowing the fire in Russia to burn itself out was a brutal policy.

HOW the Allied intervention is creating in Russia a "united Socialist front" is best seen from the following manifesto recently issued by the Socialist Revolutionary party: "The struggle of the Social Revolutionaries against Bolshevism was directed against a power which was in direct contact with the German oppressors of Russian democracy, but at present, after the defeat of Germany and in view of the fact that the intervention in Russia by the victorious Powers is assuming more and more the character of assistance given by the bourgeoisie, it has become necessary for us to abandon the struggle against the Bolsheviki." The Social Revolutionaries were the strongest party in the constituent assembly and before the Bolshevist revolution had the largest following among the peasants.

ON the very day of Mr. Lloyd George's declaration Mr. Polk announced at the State Department that the protracted negotiations between the United States and Japan for the restoration of railway traffic in Siberia had finally been concluded, "the United States formally accepting the proposal of the Japanese Government." The announcement declares that "the purpose of the agreement is to assist the Russians in Siberia to regain their normal condition." Again it states "that the United States and Japan have expressly voiced their disinterested purpose not to infringe on any existing rights either of Russia or, where the Chinese Eastern is concerned, of China." Once more: "The agreement has been reached upon a definite understanding that the railways are to be operated for the interests of the people of Siberia." All these protestations cannot undo the fact that the creation of an inter-Allied committee, even though under the chairmanship of a Russian, to supervise and operate the Siberian Railway, is a gross infringement of the sovereign rights of Russia. When in May, 1917, the then Russian Government invited American railway engineers to assist in the rehabilitation of the Siberian Railway, there was no question of operating the railway by any other authority than that of Russia. The mystery as to why the Russian Railway Corps, composed of American railway engineers, was never able to start the work of assisting the Russian railway administration has never been cleared up. Now the United States Government has yielded to the Japanese idea of assisting Russia by taking over her sovereign rights. Concerning the plan of operation we are told little. We learn only that there will be a technical board under the presidency of Mr.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stevens, and a military board, "arising from the presence in Siberia of military forces of the United States, the Allies, and Russia."

THE events of the peace conference will go far to fix the status of Japan in the world. At first she was not admitted to the inner circle of the Allies; later she met with Great Britain, the United States, France, and Italy—the fifth of the Powers as power is distributed now. This must be a gratifying fact, though perhaps not yet a satisfying one, to a people properly unreconciled to the irrational slight which the West has put upon the East. But it is a purely external fact. The real promotion or degradation of Japan depends upon the character that she reveals in the making of the settlement. The famous twenty-one demands forced upon China in May, 1915, the ruinous concessions wrung from her during the war, the suspicion of encouraging the miserable Chinese civil war for selfish purposes, the Lansing-Ishii agreement, the Japanese course with regard to Kiao-Chow (when the terms of its proposed restoration are once analyzed and understood), the ugly accusation of financial pressure exerted on China to keep her quiet at the Paris conference, and the Japanese unwillingness to accept the idea of internationalizing colonial holdings—all this sort of thing may conduce to prestige of the old kind; yet it essentially and ultimately tends to dishonor and weakness. The friends and lovers of Japan will experience a poignant disappointment if, even now, the spirit of her own Bushido does not prevail to align her in good faith with the forces which, though heavily handicapped, are yet struggling bravely for a world clean alike of race discrimination and of overlordship, political or financial.

THE way of the transgressor would appear easy in comparison with the path beset with industrial thorns which Lloyd George must now pursue. His home-coming, far from being laurel-crowned, is clamorous with labor problems. Neither his recent address in the House of Commons nor that of the Crown was successful in quieting restless trade unionists, despite the palliatives of housing reform, adequate wages, restricted hours of work, and vaguer promises of redress of grievances. The Premier's expressed determination 'to fight Prussianism in the industrial world exactly as we fought it on the continent of Europe, with the whole might of the nation" met with a "chilling silence" from Labor members in the house. There is in the post-war demands of British labor a more fundamental element than the cry for shorter hours and more wages. Workers declare that they will no longer consent to be merely "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Miners, railroad men, and transport workers—the great triple alliance—in addition to much shorter hours, demand the nationalization of land, water, and mines, and some control over shop affairs. There are reports that a strike involving a million and a half workers is likely to occur on March 15, and even the trade-union leaders, heretofore said to deprecate the unruly conduct of the members, are reported to be more or less in sympathy with the proposed strike. The threatened disaster may be averted by the so-called National Peace Congress for Industry—an assembly to be made up of representatives of labor, capital, and the Government—which is expected to meet before the end of February. Such a congress, if it succeed in accomplishing its purpose, might be an example for the United States to follow.

NOW that our hands are freed in Europe, each week brings its budget of news and editorial articles calling for intervention in Mexico, "either by financial aid [!], with the practical control that implies, or, if Mexico refuses that, then by overwhelming force of arms," to quote the outspoken *Evening Sun*. Of course it is a sacred duty that calls us. Mr. Francis H. Sisson, of the Guarantee Trust Company, in addressing the Council of Foreign Relations recently, irradiated the moral firmament with this blazing luminary:

> I believe there is a much higher law involved in these questions of governmental readjustment than the right of self-determination. I would be almost willing to advocate an international law of eminent domain in which the interests of society as a whole would have precedence over any integral part thereof.

Forward, in God's name, anointing our shining silver shield with the oil of gladness! Do not the highest interests of an imperilled civilization demand that the profits of Mexican mines and oil-wells enrich our capitalists instead of benefiting the Mexican people? Meanwhile the Mexican barbarians have arranged for an interchange of students and professors between their National University and the University of Washington. President Carranza, in an address refusing reëlection and urging unity in support of the constitutional reforms of 1917, says:

> An enemy to those reforms is still in the field, rich, powerful, organized, not yet confessing defeat and looking forward hopefully to the possibility of a reaction in this republic against the work of our revolution. . . . I am speaking of those dissatisfied Mexicans who, having lost the fight at home, have established abroad the seat of their intrigues, and in their struggle against the Constitutionalists are making use of elements that are essentially foreign, relying especially on powerful foreign financial interests which still seek to bring about the overthrow of this Government. Mexico's situation is surprisingly similar to what it was in the year 1860 [when the Clerical party, defeated in Mexico, appealed to Europe, bringing in Maximilian and the French intervention].

President Carranza discloses a disagreeable power of drawing historical parallels.

THE Overman Committee goes from bad to worse. We thought that it had reached about the lowest depths of stupidity, ignorance, and unfairness when it gave Messrs. Bielaski and Stevenson public opportunity to slander whomsoever they might desire among their fellow citizens; but we had not realized the possibilities of this august body. One fine day it discovered "Bolshevism," and straightway it set out to eclipse its former achievements by making all arrangements to slander a nation. Announcing that it would hear no "Bolshevik agitators," it went on to pick out a series of witnesses who would heap abuse on the present Government of Russia. We have no space to deal with individual witnesses or their specific testimony. Suffice it to say that it is mostly the same sort of wild hearsay with which our press has been filled for months; little of it would stand for five minutes in any court of justice. The whole conduct of the "investigation" and the questions asked by the Senators are little less than an insult to the intelligence of a people many of whom, at least, are eager to know the truth. What can be the purpose of the Overman Committee? What possible object had it in making itself party to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attempted besmirching of Jane Addams and Lillian D. Wald? And what has it in view in darkening counsel by words without knowledge out of the mouth of prejudiced witnesses concerning the present state of Russia? Frankly, we do not in the least understand the Overman Committee; but we have one consolation—March 4 is not far distant.

WE have emerged from a war to end war with a naval appropriation amounting to $721,000,000 for building ten battleships and ten scout cruisers. Congress and the American people are in the dark as to the need for this extraordinary appropriation. A mysterious message sent by the President and revealed by Chairman Padgett to the House Committee on Naval Affairs resulted in a unanimous report in favor of the bill, but the words of the message were withheld from indignant Congressmen. They were told by Mr. Padgett, however, that the President was "very earnest and very insistent." The bill as finally passed contains the old Hensley clause providing that the programme may be suspended if a competent instrumentality for international peace is set up. The peace conference, however, has thus far made only vague allusions to possible disarmament, and it is likely, therefore, that our naval programme will be carried through as it stands. Is it intended for the protection of our own coasts or for helping other nations of the league to police the seas? Why should a secret cablegram from the champion of "open covenants" settle the question of our naval policy?

SECRETARY Baker has once more parried for time before considering the question of general amnesty for military and political offenders. An investigation is, however, under way, following the Leavenworth petition which was carried to Washington by Colonel Rice. In the meantime court-martial sentences have been revealed which are shocking to the whole country. Three hundred and seventy thousand American soldiers have been court-martialled during the war, under a system which allows a man no counsel, an archaic system comparable to that of the eighteenth century. For trivial infringement of military command soldiers have been ordered to be shot or thrown into jail for life. The testimony of Brigadier-General Samuel T. Ansell before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has given a salutary shock to American complacency; it ought certainly to result in reformation by the prompt passage of remedial legislation. But even such legislation will not right the wrongs of those already outraged by courts-martial; in their hearts burns a rankling sense of injustice that demands attention from the War Department. We ought not to forget, either, the civil prisoners—some 1,500 in number—now in the Atlanta and Leavenworth Federal penitentiaries. Many of them are imprisoned for no crime save that of entertaining unpopular opinions. From these men and women come reports of treatment unbelievably malignant. Allowing even for great exaggeration, such stories as theirs need investigation. Would it not, in fact, be an excellent time, when the minds of men are stirred by the disclosures of General Ansell, to let the light into all our jails, and discover just how widespread are such evils as our military and political prisoners have endured?

OF all the testimony thus far given before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in its hearings on the pending railway legislation, none has surpassed in interest and importance that of A. B. Garretson, president of the Order of Railway Conductors. Mr. Garretson comes out strongly in favor of Government ownership, declaring that "until the operating officials of the railroads have become convinced that the future lies with the Government and not with Wall Street, Government control will never get a fair test." He favors the plan of operation by the employees already put forward by the brotherhoods. "Will the Government," he asks, "go into partnership with the workers, who will not shave dollars at the sacrifice of service, or into partnership with corporations, which are organized for profit? Which would be more desirable?" Government guarantee of privately operated railways, in his opinion, would be a "fatal mistake," and would put operation "on a plane of mediocrity." Mr. Garretson's suggestion that Government-owned railways might be used to shift labor where it is most needed awakened interest among members of the committee, as did also his warning concerning the seriousness of labor unrest. "As one who knows the danger this country is facing, I tell you that we are as near a powder mine as one can imagine. And a careless spark may start a conflagration the end of which is difficult to foretell." "It is the fashion now to denounce Bolshevism, but when you consider the underlying causes that make for Bolshevism they are an indictment of the whole social structure." When sober and responsible labor leaders use this sort of language, it is time for business men and politicians to give serious attention to the study of causes and the devising of remedies for present evils.

THE work of making the universities safe proceeds apace. The *Daily Missoulian* of February 8 carried a telegram from Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, head of Montana's educational system, suspending Louis Levine, professor of economics in the State University, "for insubordination and for unprofessional conduct prejudicial to the welfare of the university." Among the younger economists of the country, few are more favorably known for scholarship, sobriety, honesty, and modesty than is Professor Levine. In September, 1916, he was invited to the University of Montana as one specially qualified to combine State work with teaching, and was encouraged to study the problems of taxation. Last year the chancellor accepted his suggestion for the publication of a series of bulletins on the State tax situation, and his teaching schedule was lightened to give him time for his investigations. In March, by invitation, he spoke on mine taxation at a State conference of farmers at Lewistown, the university paying his expenses. This address attracted the unfavorable attention of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, and an attack on Professor Levine in June last followed. In November he completed his study of mine taxation and laid it before the chancellor. On December 28 the latter informed him that the university would not publish it, and requested Professor Levine himself to postpone publication indefinitely. Professor Levine, like an honest man, proceeded to find a commercial publisher, and issued his book through B. W. Huebsch. We have examined the book. It advocates no new or startling theories of taxation; it is a sober examination of facts, and its offence consists in stating the facts concerning the Anaconda Copper Mining Company. The university that dares not publish such a book is no university, but a private possession. Readers of the *Nation* may expect shortly a full account of this important case.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Net Result

IN fairness to all concerned, it is now time to face the fact that up to the present moment the peace conference has not accomplished anything which might reasonably meet a single liberal hope. We are careful to say hope rather than expectation, for there are sound reasons why liberalism should have expected little from the peace conference but defeat and shame. We have hitherto purposely abstained from any gloomy forecast of the practical outcome of the conference, but we believe that the time has now come to measure it stringently by the formulæ given out from time to time during the war for the sake of bolstering public confidence and stiffening the public will. These formulæ represented important and precious concessions to liberal principles, and the issue of the peace conference will properly be held to show whether they were the earnest of a purposeful intention or merely the shuffling sophistry of glib and dishonest old men.

So far, at least, the conference has consistently ignored the spirit and principles of liberalism as indicated by these formulæ. The war, for example, was to make the world safe for democracy—meaning, perhaps, political democracy, though liberals hoped for at least a measure of real democracy to make the gain more nearly worth the sacrifice. Even according to the ordinary canons of political democracy, the working conference itself is an absolutely unrepresentative body. At the best, it represents the Governments of the five great Allied states, and the recent American and British elections make one wonder how far the Governments represent the peoples even of those states—and what of the other hundreds of millions whose destinies are being decided? Quite aside from this evident political fact, there is no alchemy, as Herbert Spencer says, whereby golden conduct can be gotten out of leaden instincts; and it is sheer credulity to suppose that democracy or any of its works can be effectively served by men whose ideals, interests, activities, and loyalties would find no place in a democratic society. It cannot be over-emphasized that if true democracy were established to-morrow, Messrs. Clemenceau, Orlando, Lloyd George, and their associates would find themselves absolutely out of place in it; for they have no understanding of democracy and no sympathy with it. So much for the constructive efforts of these gentlemen to make the world safe for democracy. So much, *a fortiori*, for the prospects at their hands for freedom of trade, freedom of the seas, open covenants of peace openly arrived at, self-determination, disarmament, and the other desiderata of liberalism which have had abundant lip-service in the formulæ of the war.

But the league of nations, we are told, is a reality—a reality that wins President Wilson handsome praise from the New York *Times*. The most pestilent and exacting liberal ought perhaps to be satisfied with this sanction. Yet despite the chorus of praise in the press, we venture to assert that what has been planned at Versailles is no league of nations at all. What we have all along consented to call a league of nations is in reality, of course, a league of Governments, which is a very different thing from a league of nations or peoples. But, waiving that point, what we have offered us at present as the *magnum opus* of the peace conference is not even a league of Governments. The document read by President Wilson on Friday last is primarily the draft of a treaty among five Governments, the memorandum of a working arrangement having in view the organization and apportionment of the material results of victory. There is nothing new in this; it is what was to be expected as the outcome of the war, no matter which side won the military victory. We see nothing, however, that essentially differentiates this particular distribution of the exploiting power from other alliances of the same kind. It may be competent for the *Times* to say how the course of France in Morocco, for instance, or of Austria in Bosnia and the Herzegovina, would have been moralized and improved under a "mandatory" system rather than under a quiet gentleman's-agreement, but we frankly decline the attempt.

In speaking thus plainly of the so-called league, we wish expressly to dissociate ourselves from all criticism based on grounds of narrow and exclusive nationalism. We are aware of the high hopes kindled in many liberal minds by the announcement of the league, and we admit that an overruling Providence may conceivably in course of time transform it into something widely different from what now appears about to be set up. But to admit the possibility of miracles is one thing and to reckon on them is quite another. Scrutiny of the proposed constitution fails to show that as now planned the league will incorporate a single new principle beyond those already tried and found wanting. Five great Powers form their alliance, allowing four other unnamed states to join them on sufferance. They enter into engagements not to make war except on certain specified conditions; and they declare that armaments shall be reduced "to the lowest point consistent with national safety." (What armament ever exceeded this limit?) They undertake to "respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the states members of the league," and they provide certain machinery for the adjustment of disputes by means short of war. All this has been tried over and over again, and each time it has failed lamentably. Apparently we are simply to create more machinery to keep states in order, making no provision for removal of the political-economic causes of strife. If Governments are to remain organs of economic exploitation, then the adding of machinery means little more than the strengthening of their hold over the peoples, and the fears of those who see in the proposed league only a new instrumentality for the maintenance of the economic and political *status quo* appear well founded.

The world situation demands far-reaching economic readjustments; the peace conference offers us instead certain anachronous political and military devices, calling them a league of nations. The question that the peoples of the world must ponder is whether this net result is commensurate with the outlay. Is it worth, for example, a direct cost running into the hundreds of billions, and an economic wastage totalling probably as much more; the loss of approximately ten million lives; the destruction of civil liberties, and the deterioration of the human spirit under the influence of hatred and cynicism; the encouragement of greed and avarice, and the recrudescence of a narrow nationalism? No, the world will surely decide that it must have more for its investment than this, and it will get more; but not, we fear, by way of the peace conference. The diplomats there assembled seem not even yet to realize that social struggle is entering upon a new phase characterized by class alignments rather than national alignments, and by the use of economic weapons. The future lies with statesmen of another point of view.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Testing of France

THE intimation that the peace conference may be transferred from Paris to some other city, perhaps in a neutral country, if the hostile attitude of obstructive tactics of certain French statesmen and Paris newspapers do not cease, may be only a threat. For one thing, none of the neutral capitals could provide the elaborate accommodations which the conference seems to require. There is some vagueness, too, about the character of the obstruction which the conference is reported to be encountering, and the identity of the individuals who are alleged to be responsible for it. But the threat itself, whatever may come of it, uncovers a situation which for some time has been painfully apparent to close observers of the Paris proceedings, and which, if not speedily remedied, bids fair to cost France a substantial portion of the respect and esteem in which the country and its people have been held, not only in the United States, but in the Allied countries also.

The attitude of France at this moment, as represented by certain of its leaders and a section of its press, is peculiarly disturbing to this country. It would be hard to exaggerate the regard which the average American feels, and has felt throughout the war, for France and its people. In spite of the difference of language and political institutions, and the general ignorance among the American masses of French history, social habits, and points of view, France has nevertheless been everywhere regarded with a feeling akin to affection. The sudden invasion of its territory by the Germans and its brave defence; the destruction of hundreds of its towns and villages, and the devastation of some of its richest regions; the daily sufferings of its population from lack of food; the burden of debt, and the appalling loss of life—all these, borne as they seemed to be with rare fortitude and stanch courage, marked the nation as one to be admired, and as one, too, for which no aid that might be extended could be too large, too immediate, or too constant.

It was not necessary that France should be grateful, and it is certain that the United States did not seek its gratitude. But the fact that spokesmen for France repeatedly voiced its appreciation, and that the Government and people of France continued to accept, as a friend in trouble might do, everything that was offered and even asked for more, naturally created the impression that the two countries were moving on lines of common interest and sympathy, and that in the settlement of the main peace problems they would be found working side by side. But the events of the past few months, and especially of the past few weeks, threaten to shatter this pleasant dream and with it the image of France which the American mind has built up. Already, before the armistice was signed, a representative of the French High Commission at Washington, speaking to an audience of business men at New York, virtually gave notice that the United States would be expected to provide a billion dollars, more or less, for reconstructive purposes in France. As soon as the Germans were driven from Alsace-Lorraine, France occupied the evacuated territory, extended its laws over the provinces, created a commission to reëstablish appropriate governmental institutions, and announced that the question of French title to the region was not open to debate by the Powers.

The extraordinary incidents involving France which have developed in connection with the peace conference scarcely need to be recalled. In direct opposition to Mr. Wilson's championship of a league of nations, Premier Clemenceau proclaimed his adherence to the old theory of a balance of power. When Mr. Wilson, with Great Britain to sustain him, called for open sessions of the conference, France demanded secrecy, clamped on the censorship, and invited the press of the world to content itself with inspired communications and official statements. The French censorship of news is to-day practically as rigorous as at any time during the war, and there would have been no news worth reading of the doings of the peace conference had not Great Britain and the United States insisted upon freedom for their own correspondents.

Other charges, multiplying, it would seem, as the days go by, are no less weighty. France is not only claiming the whole of Alsace-Lorraine without discussion, but insists that Germany, for the benefit of France, shall be pushed beyond the Rhine. The Government of M. Clemenceau is standing solidly for all the claims of France under the secret treaties, including predominance in Syria and the right to a voice in the reorganization of the Turkish Empire. Mr. Wilson's proposal for a conference with the various Russian factions was hotly resented in France by men of marked prominence. Notwithstanding the drastic terms of the armistice, France is insisting that the extension of the armistice shall embody terms still more severe, and that, in general, the Allies shall see to it that Germany, even before the peace terms are concluded, shall be so crushed and plundered as to leave it abject and helpless in the hands of the conquerors. Nor is this attitude of obstruction directed against Germany alone. France is at this moment reported to be opposing strenuously any leniency in the matter of German trade, not merely on the ground that German trade must be kept from recovery, but on the further ground that if trade with Germany is reopened, Great Britain and the United States, which have ships, will obtain the bulk of it, while France, which has no ships, will get none.

It is unpleasant to recount such instances, even when they are matters of common knowledge. One would gladly believe, too, that the reported attempts of unnamed persons or agencies to stir up ill feeling between American troops and the French people, or to represent American soldiers as much preferring the Germans to the French, exist mainly in imagination. The plain record of facts, however, is disquieting, and it is not rendered any less so by such shifty and fulsome remarks as those which M. Clemenceau is reported to have made to the American correspondents the other day. Unless the true state of the case has been gravely misrepresented, the temper of France, or at least of many of those who speak for France, seems suddenly to have been transformed. Where formerly it appeared to be generous, it now seems narrow, self-centred, grasping, and, towards the Germans, vindictive. Where once France could be greeted as a loyal ally, it is now increasingly found in opposition. The situation is as unhappy as it is regrettable, and it is dangerous as well; for if the impression once becomes fixed that France, now that it has been freed from the German peril by the indispensable aid of Great Britain and the United States, has neither eyes nor ears for anything save its own national safety and aggrandizement, the revulsion of the feeling now so friendly will be great and lasting. One cannot but hope that the public men and the press of France will realize the danger, and repair the injury before it is too late.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exile Made to Order

IN arbitrarily excluding a body of aliens whom it considers undesirable, the United States is undoubtedly well within its legal rights, so far as it does not infringe treaty obligations, and we do not wish at this time to criticise the principle upon which it proceeds in such cases. We desire merely to point out that the law which expresses this principle is a bad one and should be amended. The first deportation laws were written into the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, which stirred the country to quick and effective revolt against the powerful Federalist party. Since then, the power of deportation has gradually, by a process of enactments and judicial interpretations, become centralized, until now, under the amendments of 1917 and 1918, it rests practically with the Secretary of Labor, who, it may be pointed out, is not elected by the people, does not represent them, and is not responsible to them. This power, too, has become so monstrously enlarged that not only aliens may be deported but naturalized citizens as well, by the simple formula of revoking their citizenship. Native American women who have married aliens are subject to exclusion under the anachronous and humiliating legal provision that a wife's citizenship follows her husband's. It has even been found possible to deport citizens of the United States by holding them as aliens and putting upon them the burden of proof that they were native-born. Federal Judge Holt said in *U. S. ex. rel. Bosny vs. Williams* that the method of procedure in deportation cases

> disregards almost every fundamental principle established in England and this country for the protection of persons charged with an offence. The person arrested does not necessarily know who instigated the prosecution. He is held in seclusion and is not permitted to consult counsel until he has been finally examined under oath. The whole proceeding is usually substantially in control of one of the inspectors, who acts in it as informer, arresting officer, inquisitor, and judge. The Secretary who issues the order of deportation is an administrative officer who sits hundreds of miles away and never sees or hears the person proceeded against or the witnesses.

It is difficult to imagine a more direct encouragement to administrative tyranny than is afforded by these legislative arrangements. Irresponsible authority always tends to become oppressive; and our society is at present dangerously saturated with a sense of this tendency. It is uneasily suspicious of its servants, as Mr. Wilson calls our officeholders. The present, therefore, to put it delicately, is an extremely unpropitious and unfortunate time for any display of arbitrary authority; and it seems to us that an officeholder who has even rudimentary understanding of the function of a public servant under a democracy would, from motives of expediency, if not from principle, resolutely incline the opposite way.

We do not know what truth there is in the published account of wholesale deportation of aliens, nor have we heard of anyone outside the Department of Labor who does know. We regret the coincidence of such deportation with the movement to organize unskilled labor, with the organization of an independent labor party and its proposed affiliation with the Farmers' Nonpartisan League. We think that this coincidence calls for a frank avowal of policy from Secretary Wilson. Confidence in the Administration was shown by the November elections to be impaired beyond hope; nothing could go farther to disable it utterly than for the Secretary to countenance the suspicion that he is doing something in the dark which will not bear the light. If he is honorably and properly administering a bad law, so much the more credit to him; we are entitled to know it. If, on the other hand, he is unwilling to say frankly what he is doing or not doing and why, if he is not willing to take the amount of trouble necessary to manage the temper of an irritated and uneasy people, he will have only himself to blame for the general assumption that he is making an improper use of an originally improper and autocratic authority, in order to shift responsibility for the present industrial unrest squarely upon the most exposed and vulnerable wing of the propertyless dependent class.

Secretary Wilson would greatly improve his chances of squaring himself with the current common sense of fair play prevailing among his countrymen if he would carefully consider the representations of Secretary Gresham to a foreign Government in the Wiener case, when that Government was proposing to deport an American citizen:

> That universal sense of right and justice which suggests that no man should be condemned without a hearing would seem to require that the person singled out for expulsion should, as a general rule, first be notified of the charges against him and given an opportunity to refute them. If the case is so urgent and the presence of the foreigner so dangerous to the state that this can not with safety be done, the expelling Government is under obligation to the Government of the person expelled to explain the grounds of its action, by not only asserting but proving the existence of facts sufficient to justify the expulsion.

Women's Wages

IN spite of the popular belief to the contrary, war has not brought industrial advantages to women workers in this country; instead, it has brought new problems and dangers. Temporary high wages in war industries have already ceased; women discharged from munition and gas-mask factories, where they earned $20 or $25 a week, are reluctantly taking positions at $10 or $12, if, indeed, they are reinstated in their old places at all. In ordinary peace-time occupations, such as laundry work and paper-box making, wages have risen little, despite the increase in the cost of living. With the men returning from the army, female labor is bound to flow back increasingly into these old occupations, thus putting increased pressure on wages.

The employer of women to-day is in a large proportion of cases heavily subsidized; for there is a considerable gap between the $9 a week that is paid to a girl and her actual cost of maintenance. Who makes up the difference? In the employer's mind, it is usually the girl's family—which is often mythical. One Baltimore employer remarked naïvely to an investigator: "That is the beauty of our Baltimore situation; they all live at home and so can live much more cheaply." Living at home, however, does not necessarily mean that a girl receives financial aid; more often it means that she gives it. Where she is inadequately paid, it usually signifies little more than that she has companions in poverty.

The employer's feeling toward the woman employee as one who has not emerged from the family group is unfortunately shared in many cases by the worker herself, and her feeling hinders organization. Of course there have been instances in which women have been effectively organized; in the garment trades of New York, for example, 35,000 girls, after a strike of only two or three days, were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

granted a forty-four hour week and all their other demands. But, broadly speaking, for some reason or another, organization of women workers has not attained a high degree of success. This may simply be the result of inexperience on the part of the female workers in effective methods of coöperation. Certainly the method which has been effective in maintaining the wages of special groups of men has had little influence on the pay of women.

Women's wages in general have been, and remain to-day, conspicuously inadequate to support the worker on any reasonable scale of comfort, and the result has been an attempt on the part of the States to improve the situation by the enactment of minimum wage laws. Twelve States and the District of Columbia now have such laws, and the records of their minimum wage boards are deserving of careful attention. A recent announcement by the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia declares that women and girls cannot live in Washington on less than $16 a week; some of the trades looked upon as skilled pay no more than $12. Last November the State of Washington raised its minimum wage rate to $13.20 in all occupations, trades, and industries during the war. The next highest rate established anywhere is $11.61, set by Oregon as the minimum for a fifty-four hour week for women employed in factories and laundries. In general the minimum for the adult and experienced worker has been put at $10.

A minimum rate of $10.25 suggested for the Baltimore women in a recent report allows for less than a fifty per cent. increase in total expenditure since 1909, though the actual increase in the cost of living there has been much more. Considering only the period from 1914 to 1918, the cost of food, as shown by a recent study covering a large number of cities, increased forty-eight per cent. in Cleveland (lowest figure in the United States) and eighty-three per cent. in Baltimore (highest); clothing increased seventy per cent. in Cleveland (lowest) and one hundred and eighteen per cent. in Boston (highest). All items of living cost taken together show forty-six per cent. increase in Cleveland (lowest) and eighty per cent. in Baltimore (highest). The Consumers' League recently made a study of 100 wage-earning girls in Baltimore and of 600 working women in Washington. In the former city seventy-six per cent. were earning less than $10 a week; in the latter, sixty per cent. The New York State Industrial Commission has recently issued figures to show that of 20,597 women in factories, fifty-nine per cent. earn less than $14 a week, and only eleven per cent. $20 or more; that of 23,203 women in mercantile establishments, sixty-four per cent. earn less than $14 a week, and only nine per cent. $20 or more. It is unnecessary to multiply figures.

In calling attention insistently and continuously to such facts as these our minimum wage boards are performing one of their most important functions. The minimum wage does indeed serve to lift many underpaid women out of abject poverty and is therefore immediately important—in spite oftentimes of a pathetic discrepancy between the "comfort" minimum and the minimum as finally legally prescribed. While it is true enough that no amount of such legislation can radically change the wage situation for women, yet any effort toward improvement serves by publicity to make clearer the facts of the income situation and thereby to facilitate search for the causes of poverty and an ultimate fundamental reform.

Liberty Lost and Lamented

WE have often warned our legislators that they were going too far. We have from time to time issued the most solemn remonstrances against the autocratic and irresponsible encroachments upon civil liberty committed by our officeholders, prophesying the inevitable revulsion and the emergence of the spirit of '76. Now it has come. The hoarse cry of revolt, the rebel yell, is sounding all over the land. We hear it in the business districts, in the labor unions, in the clubs. The raucous score of the Carmagnole has its libretto new-written in the editorials of metropolitan dailies. Capital and labor, arm in arm with the idle and erstwhile filthy rich—their little superficial differences forgotten, their mutual asperities mitigated, and their vivacities subdued—are standing at last in a noble and resolute solidarity in defence of the constitutional principle of liberty.

How patient they have hitherto been—so much more patient, we admit in contrition, than we ourselves! They too have beheld, as we have, a series of infringements upon minor rights guaranteed to citizens under this principle, and have exhibited in general a calm tolerance and in some cases a spirit that might superficially pass almost for acquiescence. They have seen freedom of speech abolished with freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition, freedom of movement; they have seen the authority of conscience overridden and its devotees undergoing cruel and unusual punishment. Yet such was their patriotism, such was their sense of the unique and desperate situation in which civilization found itself placed, that they were able by a great effort to stifle the instinct of repugnance which had been bred in them by all the cumulative force of our glorious traditions; and they looked on and gave no sign.

But endurance has its limits and they have now been reached. It might have been thought that our officeholders would exercise appreciation of this extraordinary loyalty and find some way to avoid laying the last straw on the camel's breaking back. But such is not the way of officeholders; autocracy ever itches to extend its jurisdiction. And now the revolt has come, precisely as we knew, at some point, it was bound to come. No, say these devoted and overburdened spirits, you may take away our right to speak, to publish, to assemble, to go about, to petition, to obey our conscience—*c'est la guerre*. But we hope we know when it is time to put down our foot, and that time has certainly come when any Government on earth undertakes to tell us that we can't take a drink.

All hail, harassed and heroic continuators of the spirit of Boston harbor! Any previous derelictions from full support of the sacred principles of liberty we fully and freely forgive. Nay, we are even prepared to confess that we may have judged too harshly in making any suggestion of American apostasy from those principles. This new rally to the flag of freedom we welcome as conclusive evidence that we are not degenerate sons of noble sires, and we reject with scorn the suggestion that this magnificent outburst can be actuated by any motive save devotion to the principles of freedom for which heroes have suffered, bled, and died. It remains only for every true American to pledge to the cause his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor. Then, at least, all our liberties will again be safe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New United States

I. An Interview with Senator Borah

The official biography of Senator William E. Borah in the "Congressional Directory" is not a long one. He was born in Illinois, took his college course at the University of Kansas, was admitted to the bar at Lyons, in the latter State, in 1890, and thereafter, according to the record, devoted himself "exclusively" to the practice of law until elected to the United States Senate from Idaho in 1913. The rest, so far as the official statement goes, is silence. The legal battles fought, the speeches delivered, the public occasions graced, the honors received—all these, whatever of them there may have been, are left without recounting. Yet the most casual reader of the brief biography would be likely to suspect that the twenty-three years of Senator Borah's law practice were not unmixed with politics, or lacking in the personal achievements and distinctions which mark a man as presumptively fit for high political office. No more in Kansas and Idaho than in other States of the Union do lawyers work long years in modest indistinction, only to be shot into the Senate, as it were, like a bolt out of the blue. The honor which comes to them, if so be they win it honestly, is pretty certain to be a recognition, however sudden, of a personal power and ability which the public has gradually come to recognize and with which eventually it can no longer dispense. The position which Senator Borah holds in American public life to-day, whatever his colleagues or his constituents or the public at large may think of it, is conspicuously a tribute to his honesty, his ability, and his personal power.

What, however, does Senator Borah represent? To the average American east of the Mississippi he doubtless is regarded as speaking for, and in some sense typifying, the Far West—that vast, imposing reach of mountain mass, rugged and bare, rich in minerals and water-power, splashed with ranges for cattle and dotted here and there with farms of wheat and sugar beets, which divides the streams that tumble into the Pacific from those that seek the Mississippi and the Gulf. In that Rocky Mountain country, as, in a different way, in the plain and desert regions to the east and south, the very immensity and picturesqueness in which nature has indulged seem to bar forever the narrow, the conventional, or the tamely acquiescent. In the Far West, at least, if no where else, the older East has long since come to expect frank speech, a rough-and-ready way of going after things and getting them, a willingness to make experiments, and an assertive confidence in one's powers and opinions born of newness and room. To the East the West, and especially the Far West, is still "the West," and the twain have not met.

Senator Borah has many of the external characteristics of the region from which he comes. He gives you an immediate impression of frankness and directness when you meet him. There are no formalities—if you want to see him, go to him. He begins talking at once in answer to your question, sticks to the subject, and stops when he gets through. Occasionally, on topics regarding which he has expressed himself at length in public, his voice rises as if he were addressing a Senate committee rather than a solitary caller; but he is not theatrical, and his manner, however vigorous, suggests no desire to make an impression. Like the mountain peaks of the State which he represents, he is a personality among many persons, and worth exploring; and there he will stand, whether you explore him or not. Yet I should not have thought it worth while to seek an interview with him at Washington, and ask his opinion about the state of the nation and the discontents of the people, had I been convinced, that he was, after all, only an Idaho or Rocky Mountain type. We have been too long provincial and sectional—new Englanders, or Southerners, or Kansans, or Californians, or what not—to make it particularly worth while to hunt another variety. What I wanted to test in Senator Borah was not his provincialism, but his nationalism; not his views about what was agreeable to Idaho, but his realization of the needs of the nation; not his attitude towards a United States which was looking inward upon itself, but his conception of a United States which is looking outward upon the world. I wanted to discover whether or not, in this forceful infringer of party regularity, the nation had possibly a new leader. So I set down here the questions which I asked him and the answers—in substance, at least—which he gave.

"Do you think that the war has brought about a greater degree of national unity in the United States than prevailed before, or is there still an East and a West, a North and a South?"

"I think that the war has done a great deal to unify the American people. A common participation in so great a common task could hardly have had any other effect. Every section of the country, whatever its feeling with regard to any other section, has had the same aim as the others so far as the war was concerned. There are differences, of course, and in so far as they are the natural result of differences in climate or natural resources they will probably remain. In this sense we can never hope to be entirely alike. But the West, so far as political and social ideas go, differs much less from other parts of the country than ever before. The South, also, which we have been prone to look upon as more distinctly a province than any other section, has shared remarkably in this unifying development."

"How much of this result is to be ascribed to the personal influence of President Wilson?"

"President Wilson's influence has been very considerable, of course. But the situation is somewhat changed. Naturally, when the war is on, men surrender their views to the views of the commander-in-chief. His influence will not be the same in peace as in war. Now that the war is over there is a feeling that individual views, earnestly expressed, and if need be uncompromisingly contended for, are not only the privilege but the duty of the citizen. That is the way to make democracy safe for the world. I entertain no doubt of a more wholesome and thorough discussion of all public questions than has prevailed for some time heretofore. President Wilson's exposition of democracy has been accompanied by a concentration of power in his own hands which was tolerable in war but is not tolerable in peace. While his great ability will always insure him a great influence, sincere men will not hesitate to express their views when they do not agree with him."

"You are opposed, I see, to a league of nations."

"I favor anything that will bring nations closer together,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promote friendliness, and remove causes of friction. But I am opposed to any kind of international agreement which involves any surrender of sovereignty on the part of the United States. I am utterly opposed to our entering into entangling alliances with European powers, to the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, and I am against this vast scheme of financing and policing Europe. Feeling as I do about it, I could not do other than to resist any proposition of that sort to the end."

"Do you think that American public opinion would sanction the continued military and political participation of the United States in the affairs of other people—for instance, police duty, say, in Germany or intervention in Russia, or the administration of the former German colonies?"

"I do not think it would. Such a policy is alien to our national temper in that respect. Our presence in Russia at this time is a fine example of our undertaking to police Europe. I am in favor of concluding a treaty as soon as possible with the nations with which we were at war, bringing our soldiers home, and settling down to the stupendous task which we have in our own country of effectuating better laws and better policies."

"How do you expect to prevent such participation, however, if Mr. Wilson so decides? There has been, as you know, a great deal of pretty sharp criticism of Congress for 'knuckling down' to the President and merely marking time during his absence. Is there any reason for thinking that Congress has undergone a change of heart?"

"There were reasons for the attitude of Congress which you mention, although I do not think the reasons are necessarily good. There was, as I have said, a natural disposition to support the President while the war was actively on. In addition to that, Mr. Wilson's public utterances exercised a sort of hypnotic influence over the public mind, and that spirit of blind acquiescence was naturally reflected in Congress. Moreover, it must be remembered that Mr. Wilson has back of him a very heavy majority in Congress, and until lately very much of the whole American press. But that has begun to change. We feel a little freer since the November election. Of course, we in Congress who are opposed to the abandonment of our historic foreign policy do not expect to be able to prevent the President from doing anything he chooses at Paris. Neither do I, individually, calculate one way or the other as to what will be the result as to confirmation of the programme when brought home. It may be endorsed. But some of us are determined that it will not be endorsed until it is fully and thoroughly discussed. It will at least be thoroughly debated. No one ought to complain of a most thorough and searching discussion of so vital a problem. A man who is not willing to hear the other side of the question is fearful for his own position."

"Does this mean," I asked, "that the Republican party is coming back to power?"

The Senator thought for a moment or two before replying. "I hesitate to say so, but since you have asked the question I do not think that the Republican party as at present constituted is by any means certain of an immediate return to power. We have no sufficient message for the American people. We cannot win the election upon the tariff. It is true we were successful last November, but we owed that success in large measure not to our affirmative strength, but to the revolt against the President and his party. The people were not satisfied with the way things were being conducted at Washington. But the Republican party, to my way of thinking, should take a decided stand one way or the other upon these great vital problems such as the league of nations, and the future relationship of labor and capital, upon the question of getting away from the old tooth-and-claw principle and substituting the principle of coöperation. I think there is a vast amount of dissatisfaction throughout the country with both the Republican and the Democratic party because of their failure to outline distinctly a programme for the solution of these problems whose settlement can no longer be postponed without trouble in this country."

"You look for a new party, then?"

"Well, there is evidence throughout the country that a demand for a new party is widespread. It is not so much a specific demand as it is a manifestation of dissatisfaction. There could be no such manifestation of strength as was shown by the Nonpartisan League if it were not for this spirit of dissatisfaction. I think the opportunity is at hand for the Republican party to regain power and hold it indefinitely, but it cannot do so, in my judgment, upon any message which it has yet put out. I venture to express the belief and the hope that if both of the old parties endorse the proposition of entangling alliances in European affairs, assuming the obligation of financing and policing Europe, and abandoning the Monroe Doctrine, there will be a new party in this country which will represent American principles and American institutions."

"The new party, I judge, will be liberal rather than radical?"

"Yes, there is a middle ground of coöperation and joint control in industry of all kinds which is more practicable and which, I believe, is all that the majority of the American people desire. Nor do I fear any great spread of Bolshevism. If the State and the Federal Governments take up the task of removing the economic and political evils from which these things spring, we shall have no trouble with Bolshevism in this country."

"Do you perceive among business men and professional men any general recognition of a new social order?"

"I do. I think the business men of this country are thoroughly alive to the proposition that the old order is passing away. Such interviews as have been given out by Mr. Schwab, for example, are most indicative of how these business men are looking at things. I do not suppose that many of them have thought the matter through, and many of them are simply looking at the future with anxiety. But, consciously or unconsciously, there is a recognition that we must take up a new life in our industrial world. Labor and capital must get closer together. As Lord Robert Cecil has said, we have got to do a great deal more than give men higher wages or shorter hours and healthy working conditions. We have got to give labor a voice in the control of the business. Fortunately for this country, the business men are recognizing this fact. I think it is very encouraging, and I am sure it is most wholesome to have the business men of the country look at the situation in the broad way in which they now view it. The leaders of industry are aroused as I have never known them to be aroused before, and the new conception of the rights of capital and labor which is certainly coming will, I believe, find them ready to meet it at least half-way."

I could not help wondering what likelihood there was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that this outspoken, hard-hitting, independent, unconventional Senator from Idaho, frankly facing a new age without pretending fully to understand it, and with small use for political parties that do not stand for living ideas, might some day be chosen for a higher place. With this idea in mind, and taking advantage of the Senator's frankness, I ventured a final question.

"Do you not think," I asked, "that you have taken a good deal of risk in differing from your party and taking an independent stand upon public questions as you have done during the years you have been in public life?"

The Senator smiled. "A man who has political ambitions or whose success is inseparably bound up with politics naturally thinks of how his words or acts will affect his future chances. But I have the fortune to come from a part of the country which, so far as the liability of infection by certain political germs is concerned, is generally regarded as immune, and there is no great risk in speaking out when one is immune."

WILLIAM MACDONALD

James Russell Lowell: A Centenary View

By WILLIAM B. CAIRNS

NAMES in literary biography are of two sorts—those which in the first flash of thought call to mind printed writings, and those which stand preëminently for living individuals. Perhaps since our student days "Virgil" has been a heavy leather-backed book of the Allen and Greenough series; while "Horace" has moved quizzically through the Rome of our fancy, none the less real to us because the garments in which we clothe him do not conform to the latest fashion-plate of archæological scholarship. To more persons than will acknowledge it "Shakespeare" is first of all a row of thin duodecimos, and "Milton" the comfortable green-bound volume of the Globe edition; while "Walton" is a man busy by the brookside, or strolling home rod in hand across the English fields. This classification is not recognized by lecturers on literary criticism, and it differs for each individual reader, but it is by no means unimportant. We feel differently toward the works of a mere author, and toward those of a writer whom chance, or study, or kinship of temperament has led us to regard as a man. Moreover, some authors yield us immeasurably more if we give them the personal recognition that they invite. This is true of James Russell Lowell. It is to those who know *him*, with all his whimsicalities and peculiarities, that he gives his real message. In Emerson's phrase, there are those for whom he is bought and sold. His geniality and his manliness appeal to every one who appreciates simplicity and genuineness of character. His moral earnestness, his ideality, and the peculiar shade of his patriotism mean most, perhaps, to Americans of the conservative New England type. His bookishness, his minor pedantries, and the finer flavor of his individuality attract the especial sympathy of those who, if they do not live the academic life, have breathed the academic atmosphere.

The personal characteristics of Lowell may be interpreted by the trite formula of inheritance modified by environment. The Lowells are distinguished in New England for activities of many sorts. Of his father, James Russell once spoke, affectionately if a trifle irreverently, as "Dr. Primrose in the comparative degree." His mother seems to have brought into the well-ordered New England family something of mental strangeness. The boy Lowell was thus born with a tendency to idealism and mysticism, and born to a tradition of bookishness and social conservatism. It is not easy to remember that the lively political satirist, the scholarly critic, and the popular and effective diplomat was all his life a mystic, seeing visions, and even believing that he had a direct revelation from God. His devotion to books is shown in almost the earliest of his boyish letters, and he became, as he said, one of the last of the great readers. Stanch radical and democrat as his idealism led him to become, his fundamental conception was that of the old social order in New England, with its tacit recognition of culture and position. In the straitened days of his early married life, Higginson visited him to find Mrs. Lowell rocking the baby in a cradle made from a common barrel; but on one barrel-head she had painted the Lowell crest, and on the other her own. Lowell always enjoyed and admired the Hosea Biglows whom he met, but he met them in their established places.

As a Lowell, James Russell went to Harvard. Those who know intimately students and student life linger pleasantly over glimpses of the attractive and clever boy who was fined by the Harvard faculty of eighty years ago for cutting his name on the college furniture, and reprimanded for wearing other than a black coat on the Sabbath day; who edited the college magazine and read wide and deep where inclination led him, but who flagrantly neglected things in which he was not interested. He was the sort of student whom professors love while they officially disapprove, and it must have taken many annoying delinquencies to lead at last to his rustication in the family of the good pastor of Concord. After his graduation, coming manhood, the necessity of considering a profession, and above all the influence of Maria White, who afterward became his wife, tended to increase his earnestness, though to many friends he seemed his whole life long an irrepressible boy. In these earlier years he felt two calls, both louder than the one which drew him to his nominal profession,—the call of literature, and the call of social and political reform. So far as might be he made the two seem one, yet he himself knew that the voices were not wholly reconcilable, as the self-criticism in the "Fable for Critics" shows. The Smith Professorship at Harvard and the editorship of the *Atlantic Monthly* both came opportunely, and both had much influence on the course of his middle years. He was too young in spirit ever to stop growing, and even his late experiences as a diplomat wrought noticeable effects. Chief among these was an air of man-of-the-world, not quite natural and not quite affected, to be found in some of his later writings. In England he succeeded, with a cosmopolitanism rather inborn than acquired by experience, in realizing the English point of view, and, without sacrificing in the least his personality or his patriotism, in adopting the English manner of expression. His impromptu epigram on Gladstone:

> His greatness not so much in Genius lies,
> As in adroitness, when occasions rise,
> Lifelong convictions to extemporize,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is in its way as characteristically English as the happiest sayings of Hosea Biglow are distinctively American.

Conjoined with the qualities already mentioned were versatility, innate lovableness concealed sometimes by a show of the satiric, cleverness, extreme frankness, and a whimsicality which pervaded all that the man said or wrote. His frankness was partly his own and partly that of a less sophisticated age. After his engagement to Maria White their letters to one another were passed about in the group of young Harvard graduates and their sisters of which the lovers formed the centre, that all might enjoy their happiness. When we of to-day notice the self-revelation of Lowell's personal poems, and the natural openness of the addresses that captivated reserved Englishmen, we may remember that his youth was spent in Arcady. Of his whimsicality it can only be said that it was the man himself, the source of his greatest charm and of his most regrettable defects.

He who would know Lowell can do no better than begin with the two volumes of letters edited by Charles Eliot Norton. Here are wit, homeliness, the records of strong and true friendship, all expressed with the happiest informality of style. No other American letters are so delightful. But on re-reading them the student and admirer of Lowell grows more and more disappointed. In his fear that he would violate some private confidence, Professor Norton carried caution too far. Not one in ten of the letters is printed in full, and only those passages are retained which give an impression of sweetness and gentle cleverness. The result is like a photograph from which the retoucher has taken all lines that give strength and character to the face. For two or three phrases that in some way escaped the editor's pencil—like "the smutchy back-doors of hell," apropos of Swinburne's poetry—we are thankful; but for the greater part of the thousand pages we ponder over the asterisks of omission, and wonder, in no spirit of idle curiosity, what Lowell really wrote. Scudder, in his biography, was equally cautious about the proprieties; and one must turn to unauthorized commentators, to chance anecdote, and above all to the author's published works for knowledge of the man.

Lowell scribbled verse in his boyhood. Later he conceived the idea, which lasted long and died hard, that he was to be a great American poet. It is evidence of his seriousness of purpose that though his letters were filled with clever parodies and joking doggerel, his first volume contains no trace of humor. His early poems show skill in versifying, and imagination, but they are largely echoes of his favorite masters. When he is not imitative he often lacks unity in method, tone, and purpose. It was not, as he said, "a whole bale of isms tied together with rhyme," that impeded his progress, but a bale of still more heterogeneous and discordant things. All his life, the same personal quality that made his conversation seem to a visitor "like fireworks" interfered with the writing of poems that were sustained in tone. It is due as much to this defect as to his imitative tendency that he never, except in dialect, evolved a manner that was distinctively his own. There is never need to decide whether the proper adjective should be Lowellian or Lowellesque.

Both the deficiencies and the excellences of the poems connect themselves with the author's habits of self-revelation and his methods of composition. He once wrote to a friend: "I consider every poem I write (whether I publish it or not) as a letter to all whom I personally hold dear." Whimsical as he was, he let much of his whimsicality show in his verse. Moreover, a poet who was so much of a mystic wrote only when he was in a mood of exaltation. His method seems to have been to keep his subject long in mind, to plan the structure and the metrical form, but to wait for the divine white heat before attempting actual composition. Attempts at revision were rarely successful. He went over "The Cathedral" line by line and word by word and made many alterations, but ended by restoring every passage to its original form.

While "The Present Crisis" has worn better than most partisan poems, the "Vision of Sir Launfal" has a wide popularity, and the "Harvard Commemoration Ode" has received high critical praise, the poet's most characteristic work, always excepting "The Biglow Papers," is seen in a few of the shorter pieces. In some, like "The Changeling," "She Came and Went," and "Auf Wiedersehen," an overwhelming emotion saves him from lapse and change of tone; in others, like "Mona Lisa," he is held to unity of effect by an attempt to secure the epigrammatic finish of society verse. He is best when he is frankest and most personal. "After the Burial" is almost unique for its expression of thoughts which thousands of strong and devout men have known, but which they did not consider it quite right or decorous to put in words:

> Console if you will, I can bear it;
> 'Tis a well-meant alms of breath;
> But not all the preaching since Adam
> Has made Death other than Death.

Nowhere does the personal note sound more effectively than in the truer parts of the tribute to Agassiz.

In their final form "The Biglow Papers" contain as much prose as verse; but as they originally appeared it was the verse that counted, and they are properly associated with the poems. In 1846 the leaders of the Jingo party (to use a word not then coined) were trying to arouse popular sentiment in favor of a war which the national conscience half condemned. Middle-aged readers remember that during the Spanish-American war the most popular newspaper writer was a satirist who knew, as did the young abolitionist poet fifty years before, that ridicule was the only weapon effective against a cheap and flamboyant show of patriotism. Lowell used dialect as a life-long student of racy speech; but he also realized the disarming effect of dialect when exciting questions are discussed. No politician could afford to show anger at the supposed utterances of a rustic like Hosea, though he would have professed great indignation if Lowell had openly put forth the same views that Mr. Biglow expressed or ironically implied.

The second series of "The Biglow Papers" differs somewhat from the first, as Professor Lowell differed from the ardent young reformer of 1846, and as the readers of the *Atlantic Monthly* (where this series appeared) differed from those of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*. The author did not stick so closely to politics, and he tried, as it were, to see what serious effects could be produced with Yankee dialect. He hardly improved "The Courtin'" by diluting it with added stanzas; but his descriptions, as of Spring in "Sunthin' in the Pastoral Line" and his tributes to his nephews killed in war, are at least successful experiments. He had lost none of his cleverness in phrasing:

> A ginooine statesman should be on his guard
> Ef he *must* hev beliefs, nut to b'leeve 'em too hard;

and when a political situation really stirred him he could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be as pointed and as colloquial as ever. "Jonathan to John" is no whit inferior to anything in the first series; and "Latest Views of Mr. Biglow" might well have been quoted more frequently than it was a few months ago:

> Here's hell broke loose, an' we lay flat
> With half the univarse a-singin',
> Till Sen'tor This an' Gov'nor Thet
> Stop squabblin' fer the Garding-ingin.
>
> It's war we're in, not politics;
> It's systems wrastlin' now, not parties;
> An' victory in the eend 'll fix
> Where longest will an' truest heart is.

By general consent "The Biglow Papers" are ranked as our best political satire,—best, judged both by immediate political effect and by literary merit. Unfortunately political satire soon has its day. Open now an approved edition of "Hudibras" and one finds a few lines of Butler's verse heading a dreary page of fine-print notes. When a poem reaches this stage it may be studied, but it is seldom read. "The Biglow Papers" already need extensive commentary.

Lowell's early contributions to the *Anti-Slavery Standard* and his later political articles published in the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *North American Review* were timely and sincere, and they exerted a great influence on readers who were inspired by high ideals. They were, however, virtually editorial articles, full of allusion to matters of local and temporary interest, and often written with an intensity that seems to a later generation excessive. All things considered, it is perhaps well that he chose for preservation only enough of his political essays to fill a thin volume. These are remarkable for their faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy; yet the author was never blind to temporary defects and failures of our governmental system. His protest against political corruption, published in the *Nation* at a time when most Americans were complacently planning for the centennial celebration of 1876, was a characteristic utterance. There is a time to weep and a time to laugh, a time to mourn and a time to dance; but there is no time when a descendant of the Puritans shall not preach. Many Americans who deplored existing evils as much as did Lowell resented the occasion and the manner of his outburst. But he endured their condemnation and even their misrepresentation of his motives in sorrow rather than in anger, and kept quietly on his course.

The literary essays were the product of the natural Lowell, influenced by the experiences of the Harvard professorship. From a boy he had been an omnivorous reader and bibliophile. His real interest was, however, literary rather than minutely critical and philological. He loved the swing and movement of canorous verse, the subtle ingenuity of an Elizabethan conceit, the freshness of diction that helped to paint a vivid scene. In his first volume of prose he adopted the antiquated form of conversations because it gave him opportunity to make his criticisms as discursive and as personal as he chose.

It is doubtful whether Lowell's Harvard appointment had a good effect on his critical writings. He came unexpectedly to teaching when he had been nearly twenty years out of college, and he felt, more than a man who has long seen academic life from the inside, that a professor must know everything that he professes. His letters are full of passages in which he laments his deficiencies and tells how hard he studies—an average of twelve hours a day, sometimes, in vacations. Probably his name should be added to the long list of Americans who, after the infection of Harvard by German ideas, sacrificed their true bent and calling to the idol of so-called scholarship. To be sure, the acquisition of learning was not difficult or wholly distasteful to him. He was already a wide and careful reader, and an observer of effective forms of speech, and he readily acquired the habit of word-hunting, of tracing derivations and verbal parallelisms, and of analyzing metrical constructions. This gave him a certain respectability as a scholar, and furnished him with material for lectures, part of which, in turn, he worked over into his critical essays. These passages of textual comparison and analysis are not, however, the most interesting or the most valuable. Lowell's mission—and indeed that of every true critic—is to interpret the spirit of his author. He did this best in the case of the older masters whom he had read and re-read from boyhood. As a reader he was enthusiastic rather than coldly judicial, and he was likely for the moment to see all things in the light cast by the author before him. The result is many literal contradictions. Writing of Lessing, he says: "Character—the only soil in which real mental power can root itself and find sustenance"; and writing of Rousseau: "Shakespeare, Goethe, Burns,—what have their biographies to do with us? Genius is not a question of character." A hostile reviewer once compiled a long and not uninteresting list of inconsistencies like these, but he really accomplished nothing except as he showed to what class of critics Lowell belonged. Each superlative statement, whether true or untrue in the abstract, is apt in the place where it stands. It serves its proper purpose in emphasizing the view which the writer, under the inspiration of his author, wishes to present. In his best passages Lowell is almost as sententious as Emerson. In library copies defaced by ill-bred undergraduates half the sentences on some pages are marked, each with a different stroke of pencil or fountain pen, as each successive reader has indicated the passage which conveyed to him a special message.

The greatest strength and the greatest weakness of the essays, as of the poems, lie in the fact that they contain so much of Lowell. They are not the work of a scholar whose system of criticism is more important than himself, but personal remarks, as it were, giving the impressions, sometimes almost the momentary impressions, of a very individual man. The better we know Lowell, the more we appreciate the essays. Unfortunately, but obviously, the converse is also true. The frequent whimsicalities, far-fetched pedantries, unexpected puns, and unnecessary jokes, met suddenly in the midst of scholarly and serious discourse, are to the sophomore a stumbling-block, and to the graduate student foolishness. The reader who knows Lowell better tolerates them with a good-natured smile, and an admirer may find in them matter for enjoyment. They came naturally to Lowell, perhaps the more naturally for his teaching experience. The man who finds that year after year his saddest sallies are greeted with dutiful if weary laughter from the undergraduates before him loses in time the power of discriminating the quality of his humor.

Lowell passed slowly from the effervescent hopefulness of his youth to the calmer philosophy of his old age. In his later years he doubtless saw more clearly how long democracy must struggle before it wins its fullest triumph. Certainly he saw more justly than in his early abolitionist days the side of the South in the great sectional struggle. But if he grew wiser and more tolerant, he was never less of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a democrat, and he never lapsed for a moment from his stern New England conscientiousness. The diplomatic and social successes of his later years came as the unexpected but well-earned reward of all that had gone before. Then his neighbors awoke to the fact that here was a man whom the great world honored. In the excess of provincial praise that followed, many things were said which even yet hinder a just estimate of his position in political and literary history.

As an abolitionist he did much, and his work was truer and saner because he followed by a few years the radical pioneers like Garrison and Phillips. But as it was these earlier prophets whom our fathers stoned, so it is they whose tombs we piously build. The movements with which he was later identified, such as those for civil service reform and international copyright, have never impressed the popular imagination so strongly as perhaps they ought; and even here the name of an aggressive worker like George William Curtis will probably be remembered longer than his. He did more than any other one man has done to allay the hostile feeling between England and America which lingered after our Civil War. But during his Ministry at Saint James's no great diplomatic questions were settled, and his most important results were attained through the quiet and inconspicuous intercourse of a gentleman with other gentlemen. In the future history of American statesmanship not many lines will be given to his career.

After his death New England literary critics dignified him with the title of "the greatest American man of letters." Perhaps he was. But to-day the number of his poems that make a popular appeal is small, and the devotion of the man in the study to his academic verse seems weakening. Of his prose Professor Woodberry long ago felt constrained to say: "It is of a transitory nature and steadily grows less interesting." To his friends this judgment seems regrettable, but it is difficult to gainsay its truth. His political papers, earnest and highminded as they are, have had their day. A younger generation finds sounder scholarship, and with changed conditions will find greater inspiration, in other critical writings than his. If "The Biglow Papers" live, it will be among other dust-covered volumes of political satire.

As the first editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, Lowell created the best literary magazine that America has produced. At the time when the greatest American writers were in their prime he gave them an organ of expression, and brought it about that their voices were heard clearly and all together during the national crisis. The value of this service alone is almost inestimable. But the fame of the editor, in proportion to his importance and influence, is slight and short-lived. The memory of the college teacher is even more evanescent. Viewed from a time not quite distant enough to make judgment sure, it seems that, though in many fields of activity he did work of the greatest value to his nation and his age, he has after all left behind little which is sure of wide and lasting remembrance. The explanation has already been given: in every relationship of life—as publicist, teacher, editor, poet, critic—his success with his contemporaries was due largely to the more subtle and whimsical elements of his individuality. As years go by, fewer and fewer readers will gain sufficient intimacy with the man to understand fully his work and attain his message. Of all that remarkable group of New England moralists and writers, he was surely among the greatest in ability and achievement; yet he seems almost the least certain to endure.

The Shop Stewards' Movement

FROM A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

To tell the story of the ascendency of the shop stewards' movement is to relate the history of British labor during the war. The gains and losses of the workers during this trying period; the blunders of the Government and of the labor leaders as well; the significant deepening of the consciousness of the working class—all these developments forced labor to change its principles of organization and its tactics of offence and defence. The old conventional forms of the labor movement were hard hit by the war at its very beginning, and within a few months the classical British trade unionism was destroyed. Outwardly the unions remained the same mighty organizations as before; they even acquired greater recognition and were elevated to partnership in the state. But the price British labor had to pay for this recognition and partnership amounted to the abandonment of the purposes and means of trade unionism. With the famous "Treasury agreement" of March, 1915, the unions renounced all the essentials of trade unionism: shop rules and regulations, union practices and customs, the right to strike and thus to enforce collective bargaining. The substance of trade unionism is gone.

The eclipse of unionism should be thoroughly understood, because therein lies the key to the new developments in the British labor movement. One thing must be emphasized at the very outset. That the abrogation of trade-union safeguards was by no means a wanton act forced upon British labor by the Government. It is highly significant that labor was compelled to sacrifice all its means of defence and offence and all its safeguards because union rules and customs came into conflict with the paramount necessity of the state for unrestricted productivity of labor and for speedy and unlimited output.

The denunciation of trade unionism by the capitalists as a monstrous conspiracy to limit output, and the traditional complaint that trade-union rules and customs are a wanton interference by the workers with industrial efficiency, have been properly enough denied by the workers; trade-union rules were not designed to impair industrial efficiency. The purpose of unionism was the defence of the workers. In the existing structure of industry the attempt to secure the highest possible productivity and output, in the absence of trade-union limitations on the exploitation of labor, had a tendency to reduce the workers to virtual serfdom. To raise or even to preserve their status, the workers were obliged to impose strict regulations and safeguards. Where restrictions of output (ca'canny or sabotage) actually took place, it was a "war measure," employed mostly in defence against the aggressions of capitalist management.

Yet it is not to be denied that trade unionism is largely a restrictive and negative force. The workers themselves have been fully aware of the contradiction between the demand for unlimited speed, productivity, and output, and the restrictive character of trade-union control. As a matter of fact, trade unionism restricts not only the exploitation of the workers, but the free and unhampered development of the labor movement as well. If trade unionism is in any degree a drag on industrial efficiency, it is to at least as great a degree a drag upon the ultimate unity and solidarity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the working class. It is necessary to mention only the antagonism between the skilled and the unskilled, or the eternal "demarcation" quarrels among organized trades. Yet the workers were none the less obliged to uphold this purely negative control of industry because it was practically their only safeguard against industrial serfdom. There was no alternative in the existing economic structure.

And yet, the more highly industry developed and the more definite the consciousness of labor grew, the more clear did it become that a crisis was nearing. The purely negative control of industrial life ceased to satisfy labor. It was felt that the interests both of industry and of the working class demanded a radical change in the status of labor. Long before the war, the advanced elements in the labor movement began to see that the restrictive character of trade unionism must be replaced by labor control based on a positive foundation of real freedom and self-government in industry. The war speeded up this process in its own peculiar revolutionary way. It first abolished all trade-union restriction and safeguards. Under the stress of war the state requested the working class to surrender the privileges, and the working class acceded to this unprecedented request of the state. The extent and meaning of this sacrifice by labor could hardly be exaggerated. It was virtually unconditional surrender at the mercy of the state, the sole guaranty being the pledge of the Government to restore the old safeguards after the war.

There was no ambiguity about these pledges and guarantees: "Any departure during the war from the practice and ruling in the workshops, shipyards, and other industries prior to the war shall be only for the period of the war and must be absolutely and completely reinstated when the war is over." These pledges were solemnly given, were often repeated, and were even incorporated by the Government in the Munition Act. At first, accordingly, there was not the slightest doubt about the intention and ability of the State to redeem them. The only apprehension felt was that the capitalists might be eager to prevent the real restoration of trade unionism. But it was believed that any plot of the capitalists would be vain, in view of the grim determination of the working class to see that labor received in return as much as it sacrificed. In fact, every trade union and labor convention warned the Government and the capitalists that labor would stand four square for the restoration of trade unionism. And yet, in spite of this determination, and notwithstanding the generally recognized fact that labor has the power to enforce the redemption of the pledges, the difficulties of the restoration of the industrial *status quo ante* began in course of time to be appreciated. As early as 1916 the *Times* published a significant article pointing out the practical difficulties in the way of restoring pre-war conditions in industry. This article greatly alarmed the trade-union leaders, who saw in it the first sign of a capitalistic plot to prevent the redemption of the pledges given to the workers. They were unable to conceive of industry without trade unionism; they would not see that both industry and the labor movement had already outgrown the restrictive power of classical trade-union methods, and that the old negative control was obsolete.

Meanwhile the revolutionary changes in industry, initiated by the war, made steady headway. First, there was an unprecedented industrial development. The effects of the war were tremendous. In three or four years the growth of industry was in many particulars greater than during the preceding thirty years. Second, the removal of trade-union restrictions changed in many ways the very face of the labor movement itself. Demarcation lines were broken; women poured into industry; and "dilutions" practically robbed of their old meaning the terms "skilled" and "unskilled." And while the trade-union leaders were repeating over and over again their warnings, that labor would demand and get back all and every one of their safeguards, the rank and file were trying to adapt the labor movement to the new conditions in industry. They were becoming less concerned about the formal restoration of the old trade-union rules. New ideas were slowly growing in the shop; new centres of labor defence were being formed. While the central authorities of trade unionism were absorbed in political activity, the shop acquired new significance as the unit of industrial activity. New authorities sprang up and new leadership was developed out of the rank-and-file; and, though deprived of the old instruments of power, British labor was growing more buoyant and confident than ever before.

The first manifestation of the new spirit was the unrest in the spring of 1917. In a series of important strikes—the main feature of which was the obvious inadequacy of the causes alleged for laying down tools—British labor demonstrated its new conceptions and determination. The Government and the community at large were much alarmed at the extent and character of this disturbance. A special commission was appointed to investigate the causes of unrest. The reports of this commission and the public discussion that followed showed clearly that the demand for the redemption of the Government pledges to restore trade-union rules was, so far as labor was concerned, little more than a question of principle. It became plain that future labor struggles would follow other aims than the restoration of purely restrictive trade-union control. It was felt that new solutions of the industrial problem were developing among the rank-and-file, and it gradually became evident that the workers were bent on industrial control and self-government in the workshops.

The sequel of the labor unrest and the new ideas growing in the ranks of the workers was the appointment of the Whitley Commission, which in the autumn of 1917 made public its famous proposal for the creation of mixed industrial councils for the control of industry. The Whitley scheme is an attempt to satisfy the demands of the workers for a share in positive control, without changing the existing economic structure. It is the translation of the shop stewards' conception of industry into the language of capitalist production. The main difference between the Whitley scheme and the aspirations of labor is this: the Whitley council aims "to secure for the work-people a greater share in and responsibility for the determination and observance of the conditions under which their work is carried out." This is exactly what labor wants. But it is not all. The shop stewards demand a share in the control not only of the workshop, but of industry at large. The aim of the movement is self-government both in the workshop and in industry as a whole; the ideal of the movement is the abolition of capitalist production and the organization of industry as a partnership between the state and labor.

Nothing could more strongly emphasize the unprecedented tensity of the British industrial situation than Lloyd George's speech in the House of Commons on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor unrest. After enumerating the "legitimate" causes of unrest, such as a fear of unemployment, bad housing, overcrowding, and like evils, the Prime Minister strongly condemned the "illegitimate" causes—a "sedulous attempt to undermine confidence in trade-union leaders." Such is the dramatic industrial and political situation of Great Britain. The trade-union leaders are supported by the British Premier and the Tory Parliament against the rank-and-file.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the shop stewards' movement is organically opposed to trade unionism. It is in opposition only to the negative and restrictive methods of the unions and to those leaders who oppose the invigorating of the movement with the real democratic spirit which animates the rank-and-file. The shop stewards consider themselves the harbingers of a new unionism founded on a new democratic basis of real equality for all workers. The basis of the new unionism is the workshop, which is the natural unit for labor amalgamation and industrial activity. The shop stewards are chosen by all workers in the shop, skilled and unskilled alike, irrespective of the particular craft or affiliation. The complete and final amalgamation of the workers in the shop is the first step towards the great industrial union, and the shop stewards' movement is the first step towards a real industrial democracy, to take the place of the present specious imitation.

Two Cable Letters

I. The Grand Charter of the League of Nations

Paris, February 16

WILSON returns to America with the draft of a mutual security league in his pocket. It is the grand charter of the league of nations. It consists of a permanent constitution for the cabinet conferences of the Great Powers which have been settling the affairs of the world since the Armistice. It provides for mutual agreement to arbitrate or submit to inquiry all the international differences and for sanctions to enforce such submission. With scrupulous regard for national sovereignty it makes no provision for international police force. No provision is made for an international parliament or for direct representation of peoples as distinguished from Governments. Possibilities for great administrative actions by the league are opened but their development remains uncertain. Wilson feels satisfied that he has provided a framework for the league, though several essential provisions for which he contended are lacking.

As Mr. Villard pointed out in cables prior to his departure for Switzerland, every one of Wilson's victories is tentative; all depends on continued steady insistence. The covenant contains pious wishes regarding international labor legislation, internal traffic and freedom of commerce, disarmament, and the control of private manufacture of munitions, but nothing whatever is settled. The solution of several of the most knotty points is merely postponed. Germany is not admitted into the league and she may not be for several years. The league, if the covenant be adopted as its constitution, will be the permanent form of the present alliance. Clemenceau has won his point. The French governmental press clearly reflects his satisfaction in the league and the new armistice terms.

Three sharply contested provisions are omitted from the final draft. The French wanted an international police force controlled by a supreme generalissimo, but England was unwilling to put her fleet under such a command nor had Wilson authority to put the American army under foreign control. No other nation supported France. A provision providing equality of treatment for various religious bodies, designed chiefly to protect the Jews of eastern Europe, was urged by the Americans until other nations sought additional provisions for racial equality, when it was dropped. The third provision urged by the American delegates provided for some degree of direct representation of peoples or parliaments instead of mere nominees of Governments and cabinets. This was dropped after prolonged discussion. Sustained consideration of this article was the only apparent effect of the Berne conference on the Paris deliberations. Wilson was finally convinced by Clemenceau that direct representation of over a billion people was impossible and he argued at the conference that the plan for three delegates from each high contracting party secured adequate opportunity by rotation and representation by diverse parties. The similarity of representation of the executive council to the cabinet council, which has made all decisions so far reached, is striking.

This lack of a broad basis of representation is the greatest fault of the covenant. As Cecil pointed out, the covenant merely lays the basis, offering opportunity for more to follow. The whole question is what that more shall be. Many of Wilson's firmest European supporters are bitterly disappointed and declare it offers a greater opportunity for a new unholy alliance than for a liberal league of nations. The President himself is not satisfied now with the armistice terms. The midnight sessions of the committee on the league of nations wore out some of the older diplomats and told on the President. He realizes that the plain people of the world are more interested in work and bread than in questions of territory and sovereignty and that the imperative world necessity is to get industry going. He fears Bolshevism in Germany if work and food are not soon provided. Here he meets French opposition. France, obsessed with the nightmare of German peril, fears anything that may allow Germany a handicap, yet is unable to start her own business. The blockade affects neutral business as well as German, and the standstill of neutral and Central European business is closely related to the French industrial stagnation. The whole world is caught in a vicious circle. By acceding to the French military terms in the new armistice Wilson hopes to secure an opportunity to provide means for an industrial revival throughout Europe. In the meanwhile every report from Germany stresses the complete economic upset and the growing uneasiness caused by the progressive harshness of the armistice terms on civilian life.

The Prinkipo Conference is still very uncertain. Wilson will insist on the ending of hostilities before the conference is definitely settled. He resents the suggestion of Allied interest in concessions and the payment of loans, despite the frank French declarations on the subject. There is not a sign of withdrawal of aid to the anti-Bolsheviks; there are even some evidences of increase.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The third plenary conference was a mere formal show. The important discussions and debates were all held secretly in small rooms of the Hôtel Crillon or Quai d'Orsay, only the results being made public. Very possibly the President might have obtained more of the liberal results for which he strove so valiantly had there been greater publicity. On the eve of his departure he met the newspaper men in a long and exceedingly frank, friendly interview which cleared many misunderstandings which had been festering for weeks and which might easily have been avoided by earlier conversations. Until the last day the American journalists were the least informed of any national press group.

Despite its obvious deficiencies the President returns with a substantial agreement on the fundamental principles of a league of nations and with the doors still open to really effective internationalism. England was chiefly responsible for most of the practical expression, but Wilson's steady idealism and insistence on general moral principles were the decisive factors. The battle is not yet really won. The constitution may become the greatest document in world history, but frequently it is little more definite than Wilson's speeches and the points previously accepted by the Allies. The question still remains, in what spirit will it be put into practice?

L. S. G.

II. An Interview with Lord Bryce

London, February 16

VISCOUNT BRYCE made the following statement to your correspondent in London:

There is universal agreement that the Turkish empire, even as an administrative unit, and Turkish authority real or nominal over subject races, must cease. Of this the Armenians may rest assured. But the Armenian leaders themselves realize that Armenia cannot yet stand alone. The massacre of 800,000 of their countrymen and the deportation of thousands more have left the race weakened in numbers and resources. If a stable Government is to be established, the league of nations must give the mandate to some Great Power for the protection of the new nation until it can stand alone. Britain would not care to undertake this task as she is already burdened with heavy responsibilities. In my opinion the United States is best qualified to act as the mandatory for Armenia. America's motives would be above suspicion. She would be there in a purely unselfish spirit. With a small police force to keep order and a body of governmental and technical experts who could see to the development of the natural resources of the country, Armenia would shortly attain stability and prosperity. Then America could gladly withdraw. I am sure the Armenian leaders would view this plan favorably and so would the British friends of the Eastern Christians. It will be for the American people to decide whether they will follow up the work they have done in the war for freedom by accepting for a short term of years these new responsibilities for which they, more than any other Power, are fitted.

Though a new departure, this arrangement would be free from those entanglements which any entrance into European politics would involve.

Lord Bryce's opinion is not shared by the radical elements in British politics, which hold that our entrance into colonial empire would be disastrous for the cause of democracy. In fact, we may fairly claim to be the only country still free from the hypocrisy attached to the "white man's burden" nonsense.

HENRY G. ALSBERG

Foreign Correspondence

I. The Position of France

Paris, January 26

THE French have at last come to the plan of a league of nations—though they prefer to have it called the Society of Nations. Yet the rumors as to the extraordinary demands of the governors of the French Republic continue: Syria, part of Armenia, enormous war indemnities, the left bank of the Rhine, and perhaps the Palatinate as well. Failing this they want a neutral zone back of the Rhine. Most of all they want to dispose of the Bolsheviki and build up the eastern front. The explanation given by well-informed Frenchmen is that France is war-weary to a degree that no one but a Frenchman can appreciate. Though victorious it has much of the psychology of a beaten country so utterly worn down is it by its heroic struggle of more than four years. The one great yearning is that its eastern boundary be forever freed from German menace. The French remember how quickly they themselves recovered from the terrible events of 1870 and they are frankly afraid that their greatest enemy will recover with equal rapidity from what seems a much greater disaster. Theirs is the psychology of fear. That this is a mistaken attitude is the belief of the kindliest of foreign critics. Germany is far more completely crushed than the French realize. There is, of course, the possibility that there will some day be a restoration of the empire and the seating of a new emperor. But there are various ways of safeguarding the future. The Socialists believe that France should secure herself by socialistic government and the development of internationalism. The advocates of the league of nations insist that if the league takes vital shape, France will be sufficiently safeguarded without a neutral zone. Our own American high command is credited with the belief that the modern conditions of war—aerial torpedoes, long range guns, and deadly gases—are such that neutral zones are of little avail. Some of our military men have even come to believe that the only hope for the future is the control of armaments by a supernational authority or absolute disarmament. I have talked with one general who says that to know what brought on this war one need but remember that all concerned had weapons in their hands.

Why do we hear of no proposal to disarm Germany? Why do we not hear discussions of the limitation of Germany's army to a possible 25,000 men on a long-term enlistment basis? Is it unwillingness to relieve the German people of the terrible burden of taxation in support of armaments. Is it the fear of their falling prey to a Bolshevist army if they are not allowed a strong cordon of bayonets on their eastern frontier? The Allies demand the immediate cessation of the building of all submarines; why not insist that Germany pledge herself to build no warships and to transform such as may be of her present ones into merchant carriers and to sink the rest?

Germany could not complain of this, because Erzberger and Ebert have already talked of establishing a national militia in place of the army which, in their own interest, should have been demobilized much faster. Nor could Germany assert that this would leave her open to attack from other sources. The present European Allies are, of course, so spotless in their motives and so determined to make the world safe for democracy that any thought of aggression on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their part would be entirely out of the question; besides which the league of nations will see that the Poles and the Jugoslavs and the other new nationalities do not cast covetous eyes upon their neighbors.

This is, I fear, too rational a solution to be accepted by this peace conference. Disarmament is the most important thing to be achieved. Therefore one hears less about that than about anything else. The word is not used. The limitation of armaments is urged by General Smuts though he is apparently unaware that the dictionary holds such a word as navy. On the other hand, the American who is perhaps best informed on the league of nations tells me that the leading British advocate feels there is no possibility of disarmament at present. This is grave news, indeed, for if the nations must go on with the mad race for armaments, burdened as they are with present war debts, the prospect of human happiness is dark. The most unpopular thing in the world to-day is the carrying of arms—about which I could tell some interesting things if the censor permitted.

I laid these proposals, as to German disarmament, before a high military authority here and found him in sympathy. He himself would have had the armistice require the complete disarmament of Germany on sea and on land and would have limited the terms to that. There would then have been no need for an army of occupation, and the Allies could have gone on with their plans for disarmament. But the remedy was too simple. Will the Allied military men try to prevent the complete disarmament of Germany to protect their profession? Not if they are like the veteran I have quoted. He is heart and soul in favor of the immediate limitation of armaments, and the absolute forbidding of compulsory military service everywhere. He said, incidentally, that there would never be universal military service in America unless America had gone mad. He then remarked significantly, "I should not be surprised if the Germans forestalled the peace conference by themselves abolishing universal service and substituting some form of national militia."

This would, of course, be the best answer to French fears. The French have had one man killed of every thirty souls living in France when the war broke out, and a similar number disabled—one in every thirty. A recurrence of such a catastrophe must, of course, be made impossible. But the question is which course will be more effective to this end—disarmament, or a retention of the military system which made the explosion of 1914 inevitable? Even with the menace of German militarism removed there are still territorial claims made by France which must be reckoned with.

It is not fear of Germany which made MM. Franklin-Bouillon and Chéradame begin their counter offensive to Mr. Wilson for his humane action in regard to Russia. It is not for the permanent safeguard of her eastern boundary that France lusts after Syria and part of Armenia, desires a controlling hand in the Balkans, and covets one of the two German cables to America. These matters stand in a different category. Some are championed by a few militarists, some by a handful of imperialists. Some of them are probably advanced as trading points, and are not to be taken too seriously. Yet it is undeniable that they bear seeds of possible discord between France, England, and America, and the sooner they are uprooted the better.

The Chéradame incident is disquieting because the atmosphere here is already so electric. A keen British observer said some time ago that during the first month of Mr. Wilson's stay in France he would be the most popular man who ever entered Paris; in the second month of his stay there would be mutterings and protests against his leadership; and at the end of three months he would be the most unpopular man in France. The first two prophecies seem to have been verified. All the more important, therefore, that the third should not be. It would indeed be a misfortune if any thing could mar the fine feeling between the two countries. If rocks are to be avoided, it is essential that we have a clear understanding of the attitude of France, which seems to onlookers grossly materialistic and imperialistic. Americans at home may perhaps judge more leniently and with greater appreciation than do many here, who feel that the French proposals make not for a better world but for a worse one. The only safety for France, as for all the world, is to do away with the weapons for human slaughter.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

II. The Question of the Scheldt

The Hague, December 15

THE question of the Scheldt has been a bone of contention between Holland and Belgium ever since the seventeenth century. In those early days, when political economy was based on the Christian maxim, "My neighbor dead, I'll have more bread," Holland abused her new power to settle the question in such a way as to cut Antwerp off from all connection with the sea. After the city, in 1585, had surrendered to the Duke of Parma, the Hollanders felt no scruples in treating the old rival of Amsterdam with all the severity which subjects of the Spanish king deserved. So, at the peace of Münster, the States General claimed and obtained the right to close the Scheldt. For a century and a half Antwerp was a dead city. When, in 1803, Napoleon visited the place, he found it little more than a ruin. "It is hardly a European town; I felt as if I walked through some place in Africa," he said to the Burgomaster on returning from an inspection of the docks. He intended to make Antwerp the naval base for his attack on England, but everything had to be built anew; wharves, quays, docks, arsenals. In England the danger was realized; the British sent an expedition that was to capture Antwerp, destroy the French fleet that was building there, and demolish the arsenals. The story of its disastrous failure on the Isle of Walcheren is a well-known page in British history. Nor did the Allied Powers, five years later, fare any better in their attempt to take the city, which was successfully defended by Carnot. Only by the convention of April 23, 1814, did the French agree to evacuate Antwerp and the other fortresses they still held on foreign ground in exchange for the withdrawal by the Allied Powers of all their forces from French territory. Thus the danger was for the time averted, and at the Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814, the British delegates insisted that Antwerp should be declared a commercial port only.

"L'histoire se répète," but the repetition, in this case, has not been an exact copy. When Napoleon planned an invasion of England, he was in a better position than Germany commanded after the fall of Antwerp in October, 1914. The French had, in 1795, extorted from Holland the cession of Dutch Flanders, south of the Western Scheldt, but, realizing that its occupation would not make them

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masters of the Scheldt unless they had a footing on the opposite shore as well, they also demanded the right to place a garrison in Flushing, on the Isle of Walcheren. After the British expedition of 1809 had proved the insufficiency of that garrison, Napoleon obtained, by a treaty of March 16, 1810, the cession of the entire province of Zeeland "in order to safeguard Antwerp against a renewal of the late danger." During the recent war, however, it was not Germany, but Holland, that possessed the shores both north and south of the Western Scheldt. And in obedience to the rights of neutrality as formulated at The Hague in 1907, Holland exercised not only a right but a duty when she prohibited the use of the territorial waters of the Scheldt for military purposes by either of the belligerents. In that way the pistol aimed at the heart of England, which in the hand of Napoleon had been a dangerous weapon, was made as harmless as if it had been unloaded.

It is not fair to overlook, as some Belgians do, the advantage which the Entente has derived from this strict observance by the Dutch Government of the rules of neutrality, whereby the Germans were prevented from using the port of Antwerp as a naval and submarine base—the very danger dreaded by Great Britain in the days of the Napoleonic wars. While forgetting that their British protector owed to Holland a safety which, a century ago, Britain failed to secure by an expedition of 40,000 men, these Belgians grumble because Holland by her possession of the Western Scheldt has hindered England from sending her fleet up the river against the Germans in Antwerp. They cannot eat their cake and have it, too. It is doubtful whether Mr. Churchill's Naval Brigade, in October, 1914, could have saved the city, if Holland had allowed the Entente to make use of the Scheldt. But let us suppose for a moment that Holland had given up her strictly neutral attitude, letting the people's wish to come to the rescue of the sister state overrule the country's international duty. What a train of calamities would have followed that step if it had not conduced to the saving of Antwerp! Germany, then at the summit of her military power, and convinced of her invincibility, would eagerly have grasped that pretext for invading Holland; the Dutch army, unprepared and insufficiently munitioned, could not have long withstood the onslaught of the enemy; Dutch Limburg, North Brabant, and Zeeland would have shared the fate of the greater part of Belgium; the invader, having the province of Zeeland in his grasp, would have become sole master of the Western Scheldt as Napoleon had been in 1810; from Antwerp submarines would have swarmed out in greater numbers than the port of Zeebrugge could ever have harbored; and Holland under German occupation would have ceased to be a refuge for the hundreds of thousands of Belgians who had fled thither before the onrush of the Kaiser's armies. Refusing to admit or even to consider the possibility of this course of events, the annexationists in Belgium lay all the blame for the fate of Antwerp on Holland and insist that their Government shall demand the cession of Dutch Flanders, south of the Western Scheldt, to Belgium.

The Dutch people and the press have taken the alarm before any official support has yet been given to this annexationist movement. Bitter words have been said and written about the ingratitude of a people that repaid a four years' hospitality to thousands of its poorest refugees with an attempt to rob the benefactor. "War would be the result," declared Mr. Marchant, the leader of the Liberal Democrats and a man of great prestige in the Second Chamber. But the danger of serious complications lies in the tragic attitude in which the Hollanders are taking these demands of their neighbors rather than in the expansionist desires themselves. The inflammable Belgian temperament, fired by the hated enemy's overthrow and the liberation of the country, gives impulsive utterance to wishes which, at a cooler moment, it will admit to be at variance with those very ideas of justice for which Belgium, together with the Allied Powers, has bravely withstood the German attack. Prussian militarism demanded the annexation of Belgium on the ground that Germany's safety could not suffer that country to remain a bridgehead for British aggression. Belgian expansionists demand the cession of Dutch Flanders, and Limburg to boot, on similar grounds of military exigencies; for on commercial reasons they cannot base such a claim.

Since 1842 the navigation on the Western Scheldt has been free *sous le rapport du commerce;* to the kingdom of the Leopolds and Albert, Holland has never raised any economic obstacles such as lamed the Belgian sea-trade in the days of the Spanish and Austrian occupation. The rapid growth and prosperity of the Antwerp harbor during the past fourscore years is sufficient proof that Belgium cannot have any grievance on that score. The military safety of their country is what these annexationists have in view. But the peace that is to come must be based not on considerations of a new war, but on conditions that preclude war in the future. By demanding half the Dutch province of Zeeland on the plea that, without it, Antwerp can never be used as a war harbor, the Belgians discredit the noble end for which their soldiers fought and bled. For to suppose the possibility of a relapse into the pre-war competition in armament and military preparedness is an insult to the wisdom of those statesmen who have promised the world a new era of peace under the rule of a league of free nations. But both the league and the freedom would be in jeopardy, if those whose task it will be to make the peace should consider it their chief concern to prevent the success of an aggressive war and not to remove the causes of all war. The population of the area claimed by the Belgian annexationists have now made clear their own feeling in this matter. It may be said without exaggeration that ninety-nine per cent. of the inhabitants of Dutch Flanders and Limburg wish to remain subjects of Queen Wilhelmina. If they were forced to become Belgian citizens, the right of self-determination, which Prussianism has always ignored, but which the Allied Powers have recognized as one of the basic conditions for a lasting peace, would be sacrificed to military exigencies, which, among a league of free nations without conscription and under protection of a British-American sea-power, have no need to be urged any longer.

The Hollanders, therefore, have better reason to rely on the consistency and wisdom of Mr. Wilson and the other leading statesmen of the Entente than to fear the effects of an agitation in certain chauvinistic Belgian circles.

A. J. BARNOUW

Contributors to this Issue

WILLIAM B. CAIRNS is associate professor of American literature in the University of Wisconsin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deported

By FREDERICK PETERSON

Chill blow the winds of the world;
There are thorns and bruises for the feet,
And lurking shadows spreading snares,
And there are bitter herbs to eat.
The only home-light shining far
Is the cold splendor of a star.

In the Driftway

APROPOS of the Lowell centenary, the Drifter recalls an anecdote which he had years ago from the lips of George Ellis, intimate friend of nearly all the New England Olympians of the past century. Ellis was travelling in Europe with Lowell's father, when one day came a letter announcing that the son, then a student in Harvard, had been elected to the office of class poet. The elder Lowell, obviously depressed by the news, confided to Ellis that he "had hoped James was through with all that poetry nonsense." One thinks, in this connection, of another genius born in that *annus mirabilis*, 1819—John Ruskin, and of the bitterness which came to him and to his parents because of his inability to renounce his genius and become the shining figure of their dreams, an evangelical clergyman! One of these days, the Drifter hopes, we shall have from the pen of some inspired bachelor or spinster that instructive and long awaited work entitled "How to Become Great in Spite of One's Parents."

* * * * *

AN old letter lies before the Drifter, sent from Paris soon after the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. It was written by the first woman oculist who performed the operation for cataract. She had left the Vienna hospital, declining an appointment as assistant surgeon with the German army, and had with great difficulty reached Paris alone. But it was not the rumble of war and the Marseillaise echoing through her letter that caused the Drifter to unfold the yellowed pages to-day. Those were stirring times as well as ours, but there was still leisure for the spirit, and the spiritual pilgrimage:

While I was in Vienna, Lowell's "Cathedral" was published, and Charles Putnam, his cousin, and I, between operations and clinics had made time to commit the whole poem to memory. I was not going to be in Paris and not go to Chartres even if a war was going on. The hotel proprietor seemed to think I was a little crazy and perhaps I was. He was for dispatching me out of France without delay. Instead I took the earliest morning train for Chartres. It happened to be Napoleon's fête day. The glorious old cathedral was ablaze with candles, and the sweetness of ten thousand white lilies, the only decoration, filled the air. I found a corner and sat down and repeated to myself the whole poem.

> A day at Chartres, with no soul beside
> To roil with pedant prate my joy serene
> And make the minister shy of confidence.

The Drifter closes the letter fondly, picturing the blue-eyed little woman reciting the stately lines amid the lilies in the Cathedral—in war time. He recalls Lowell's pleasure when he was told of the incident some years later. Was higher tribute ever paid the poet? THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Protracted Censorship

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following letter may interest your readers who may think that the censorship of the mails ended with the cessation of the war. The pamphlets referred to in the letter were published openly in a Dublin journal during he war.

VIGILANTE

New York, Feb. 2

"THE IRISH PROGRESSIVE LEAGUE,
"229 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"GENTLEMEN: In accordance with advice from the Solicitor for the Post Office Department, you are hereby notified that the pamphlet entitled 'How Ireland Has Prospered Under English Rule and The Slave Mind,' by Arthur Griffith, published by you, is non-mailable under the Espionage Act.

"Very respectfully,
"T. E. PATTEN, Postmaster"

January 20, 1919

A Bulwark of Reaction

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: President Wilson is reported to be giving considerable attention to the problem of safeguarding the rights of minority nationalities in the peace treaty. The problem is by no means easy of solution, owing to the fact that in nearly all the countries seeking recognition of their claims based upon historical or ethnological grounds, a variety of mixed races may be found. Several plans, it is said, have been pointed out by which the minority nationalities may be protected. One of these plans is proportional representation in representative bodies, by communal governments of the minority races, where there is a local majority, and by constitutional guaranties for equal religious and civil rights.

While it is indeed commendable that the President should be giving his attention to this very important and intricate question, one which must have a great bearing on the future peace of the world, it is nevertheless strange that neither he nor his party has given even slight attention to the question of safeguarding the rights of American minorities. Every national election sees thousands upon thousands of votes "wasted"—"thrown away" for the simple reason that while he has been trying to make the world "safe for democracy" he has overlooked the United States. Nationally, close to a million voters are without a voice in Congress. There is certainly nothing democratic about that.

How long, we should like to know, is the United States to maintain its anachronistic position as the last bulwark of reaction? Even England has somewhat tardily and reluctantly enfranchised its women, who seem now on the highway to obtaining absolute political equality with men. That country has also adopted a more or less scientific plan of reconstruction, and on the whole is becoming more liberal in its policies. In this respect even its colonial governments are ahead of the United States. In this connection it may be interesting to note that on December 19 New South Wales passed a bill regulating elections on the basis of proportional representation. Switzerland has had proportional representation for years. As for our whole system of representation—city, State, and national—it is hopelessly archaic and a sad commentary on the low level of the intelligence of the electorate.

WILLIAM GREENE

Chicago, January 13.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nations and Empires

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: The prayers of the masses of the people everywhere are being offered for the success of President Wilson's efforts to secure the peace of the world. For them war has never been anything but a nightmare, as victory means to them little more than defeat. It is to be hoped, however, that the President will not confound two things which, though superficially similar, are fundamentally different. A league of nations may be a guarantee of peace. A league of empires, whether they frankly avow themselves such or masquerade as republics, insures a renewal of war, for empires are founded on war and cannot rise higher than their source.

Owen Merryhue

New York, January 15

Dangerous Views

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: It is with considerable nervous apprehension that I find myself decidedly pro-German in some things. In glancing over the edicts of the German provisional government I noticed these items in one decree: The expression of opinion in word and writing is free. Amnesty is granted for all political offences. Proceedings now pending in reference to such offences are dismissed. In spite of the disloyalty involved I agree with the Prussian spirit of these edicts and I wish that our Government would issue like decrees.

James G. Stevens

Middlebury, Vt., January 17

Standardization Gone Mad

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: Many thanks for your editorial entitled "Language, Literature, or History," in the issue of January 25. It is (unintentionally) one of the best pleas for the study of the classics that I have seen for some time. Its main contentions are two: (1) that it is impossible for a statistician to tell whether the teachers of Latin and Greek are teaching language, literature, or history; (2) that the value of every subject taught must be measured by tangible results. If this is the best the critics of the classics can do, I wish them godspeed.

Observe, if you please, the faulty logic in regard to the first point. The Princeton volume on "The Value of the Classics" contains testimony to a dozen different values of the classics from as many individuals; *ergo* each teacher of the classics must be pursuing haphazard a dozen different aims. As a matter of fact, in my own classes in Latin and Greek, I teach primarily literature; my friend K teaches primarily history; and D teaches primarily language; but each of us inevitably, and without loss of primary motive, includes the other two fields in his teaching. Is not this rich variety a peculiar virtue of the humanities?

And must we not only standardize the aims of instruction, but also specify the degree of knowledge which shall be permissible? Must we all acquire a modicum of this and a modicum of that? Why not let those who wish a bowing acquaintance with Greek life and thought take a six-weeks Y. M. C. A. lecture course; and those who wish a "practical" knowledge take a two-year literary course through the medium of translations; and those who wish to master the language and literature of the Greeks devote ten good years to their study? The plain truth is that the intolerance exhibited by the advocates of modern standardization is colossal. There are values that can never be measured. Here debate ends, and faith begins.

Dean P. Lockwood

Haverford, February 7

The Great Danger

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: The idea of world federation, of international organization, which more than any other has kindled the imagination and filled the dreams of disinterested workers for humanity through many centuries, has at last come to birth in a tentative constitution for a league of nations, sanctioned by the official representatives of some twelve hundred millions of people. For months, perhaps years, to come that constitution will be the chief subject of discussion and criticism throughout the world. From extreme tories and extreme radicals will come the most formidable attack ever directed against an organized idea.

But these forces cannot succeed unless they are joined by the liberals. If the league of nations suffers defeat now, it will be at the hands of its ostensible friends. The great danger lies in the impatience, the impracticality, the lack of far and clear vision, on the part of those who demand the instant creation of some instrument that will at once heal the world of its wounds and purge it of its sins. To all such, the tentative proposals just published are bound to seem inadequate and feeble—as indeed they are. But the fact that the constitution is feebly and inadequately written counts for little in comparison with the all-important and miraculous fact that it really *is* written.

Think for a moment of the conditions of its origin! Did any sane and honest person ever seriously believe that this war would not end as all other wars have ended—that is to say, with the regulation tableau of the victor with his knee upon the chest and his hands in the pockets of the vanquished? Did any sane and honest person ever hopefully anticipate that out of the whirlwind of passion generated by this war could emerge any other than a peace dictated by chauvinism and revenge? Did any sane and honest person ever expect for a moment that the elderly diplomats assembled at Paris would do other than bend all their efforts to the strengthening and perpetuation of their own power? What the sane and honest knew would happen has indeed happened, in large measure; but along with it something else has happened of infinitely greater import. A great idea has definitely emerged into the realm of actuality, the wedge-point of a mighty principle has found its entrance.

We know, of course, that this miracle did not happen of itself. We are well aware that it is chiefly due to the vision and eloquence and determination of one man, who fought almost single-handed and in effect routed a host of powerful champions of the old order. That man is now on his way to these shores, to take up at home the battle which he waged and at last partially won abroad. He will find ranged against him every force of ignorance, skepticism, self-interest, political pettifogging, that this country can muster. Are we, the liberals and moderates of America, to join in that attack? Because of impatience and irritation that our ideals are not realized at the very outset, shall we bring to ruin a plan upon which the hopes of humanity are centred? For it is we, and only we, who have power to accomplish that incredible disaster.

Let us never forget that the first and most difficult step toward the end we have in view is now taken. The slow seed has at last germinated, the symbol is visible and accepted, the principle is established. What remains to be done is all in the nature of revision, elaboration, extension, perfection. It is a tremendous task indeed, but no more than patience and persistence and a hopeful spirit can accomplish. Revolutions in thought do not come over-night, nor by the precise paths which we lay out for them. "Men fight to lose the battle, and the thing they fought for comes about in spite of their defeat; and when it comes it proves to be something other than the thing for which they fought, and so other men have to fight for it under another name." Thus has it been with every great idea in human history. Thus will it be with the league of nations.

W. R. B.

New York, February 17

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

The Noblest Novelist of Them All

The History of Henry Fielding. By Wilbur L. Cross. In three volumes. New Haven: Yale University Press. $15.

ERUDITION has seldom before in any published work been so lavishly devoted to a major English novelist as in the biography of Fielding which now crowns the associated labors of Professor Cross, that ardent and accomplished bibliographer Frederick S. Dickson, and the Yale University Press. The Press has printed the book with extraordinary accuracy on paper of a quality now painfully rare, and has enriched it with many illustrations and facsimiles, which deserve to be inclosed in a somewhat more distinguished binding than has been given them, apparently to match that of the Bickers issue of the Murphy-Chalmers-Brown edition; Mr. Dickson, by his tireless hunt for Fielding items, by his gifts to the Yale Library, and by his manuscript indexes of "Tom Jones" and "A Voyage to Lisbon," stands as a sort of bibliographical Alexander to the biographical Aristotle, Professor Cross; and the Aristotle of this enviable partnership, if like his prototype rather dry reading at times, can hardly be overpraised for his sense and sound judgment as well as for his almost impeccable knowledge. For the first time Fielding is followed, month by month, through all the obscure places in his career, many of them due to his large carelessness of little records; and now, finally, a hundred old scandals are laid at their proper doors, at the doors of literary and political enemies who during Fielding's lifetime pelted his reputation with the unsavory mud which eighteenth-century Grub Street so well knew how to find and throw.

Fielding had become a legend before he died, thanks to his enemies; and the legend was firmly fixed by the lazy, irresponsible, Irish Arthur Murphy, who, without even decent research, wrote the "Essay on the Life and Genius of Henry Fielding, Esq.," for the authorized collection of Fielding's works published in 1762. No enemy, Professor Cross makes clear, ever hurt Fielding's reputation more than did this particular bungling friend. He trusted the spiteful tales then current; managed to make Fielding out a drunkard, a wastrel, a wencher; neglected such of Fielding's writings as he could not handily come at; and left the Fielding canon very shaky. Professor Cross has not only demolished him but has trailed his shadow down through all the intervening biographers and critics, many of whom cut sorry figures in the new light. Even Scott, so near to Fielding in vigor and manliness, could not forgive an Anti-Jacobite, preferred Smollett, and accepted Murphy without much questioning. Thackeray, who adored Fielding, took his Murphy through Roscoe's version, and then picturesquely and eloquently dressed up a false Fielding with a freedom he might properly have used only in a work of fiction, particularly erring in his assumption that Fielding the youth should be identified with Tom Jones and Fielding the husband with Captain Booth. A great novelist thus fell into the vulgar blunder of confusing a novelist with his characters. "Thackeray," says Professor Cross, "really did more than any other man has ever done to stain the memory of Fielding." Leslie Stephen, who lacked both his father-in-law's picturesqueness and his sentimentality, laid primary stress upon Fielding the moralist, upon his honest art and common sense; but he, too, owed too much to the legend, and merely softened charges which were already false, in some cases positively defaming the man whose morality he admired. W. E. Henley, naturally, refused to be Victorian about Fielding. He believed only those things in the legend which fitted his own conclusions about Fielding's books. Indeed, in his zeal to slash the Philistines he turned Fielding's reputed vices into the virtues of an enfranchised spirit—than which no process could have worse falsified the actual character of Fielding. Lowell, it seems, was the first to do justice to Fielding's sane and normal humanity. Out of Puritan New England came the earliest—in many respects still the best—true commentary upon the disposition and achievement of a man who would probably have been less at home in the Boston of his day than anywhere else on earth. Professor Cross stands close to Lowell in his final judgments, but he has a better right than Lowell to his opinions, for the reason that, following Keightly and Austin Dobson ("the man, above all others, to whom the world is indebted for a more just view of Fielding") and Mr. Dickson and Miss Godden and Mr. de Castro, he has based his judgments on facts. Biographers who have all the facts guess best, it seems.

Few great men thus minutely scrutinized emerge so whole from the ordeal. At no single point does increase of knowledge make Fielding less attractive than he has been reported. On the contrary, the realities are all better than the fictions. He stands forth without a trace of meanness or selfishness or cruelty or treachery; as good a son as he had a chance to be, a considerate brother, a constant husband, a devoted father, a faithful friend, thoroughly honest in business and journalism and politics, a conscientious literary workman, an incorruptibly just magistrate. Undoubtedly he lived well, but his family and creditors no more paid for his luxuries than they endured his gout for him—a disease, by the way, so little understood in England in Fielding's day that venison, old Canary, red port, and rum were all reputably advised as cures for it. He was highly sexed, but there is no evidence whatever that he ever seduced or betrayed any woman; his bitterest foes in Grub Street never associated his name with that of a woman of dubious character. He was not a gambler. He seems to have been moderate even in the use of tobacco, and he certainly abhorred gin and other quick intoxicants. The truth is that Fielding had immense vitality and strong desires, and that he had also immense good-nature and a strong will. Judged by any but village standards of morality he was a temperate and disciplined man.

It is true that Professor Cross argues a good deal with negatives, claiming that, where no good evidence sustains the old legend, we are justified in doubting the traditional tales of Fielding's dissipated habits. More convincing, however, is his argument that in one short life Fielding with all his talents could not possibly have found time to be the rake he is said to have been and also the scholar, writer, and man of affairs that he indubitably was. Hard pressed for money though he often found himself, he yet contrived to collect a larger working library than any other English man of letters in his century, Professor Cross says,—a library rich in law, history, divinity, poetry, and drama, ancient and modern, Horace in five editions, Homer in six, and Lucian in seven. Probably the best classical scholar of all English novelists, he was certainly the best versed in the law; a fair antiquarian, though surpassed by Scott in such matters; well read in philosophy, though in this outdone by George Eliot. Compared, indeed, with a thinker like George Eliot, Fielding exhibits his largest deficiency (if it is a deficiency which assigns him to the company of Shakespeare and Scott, his only peers in English), his unspeculative, non-scientific habit of thought. In his religion, his politics, his sociology, his psychology, Fielding agreed with his age and its solid traditions. He cheerfully damned all deists and worked hard at a refutation of Bolingbroke. He thoroughly approved of the British Constitution while condemning such abominable politicians as Walpole and his gang. As a magistrate, though one of the most merciful and self-sacrificing, he failed to see how many of the lawbreakers whom he fought with such spirit had been forced into crime by bad economic conditions and ferocious penal laws. So far as the individual is concerned, Fielding did not differ greatly from Richardson in the complexity or subtlety of his code for behavior; both conceived of a more or less obvious line dividing good and evil, justice and injustice, decency and indecency. But for Richardson the line of offence ran between actual deeds, lawful on one side, unlawful on the other, and all provided for by the law. In Fielding's code, motives and not acts ranged men on this or that side of the line, and then only temporarily.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even murder and adultery were less truly evil than the brutality or selfishness which led to them. And of offences in general, all were more or less venial except calculating treachery and habitual meanness and cold-blooded hypocrisy. The indispensable virtues in the premises were kindness and good nature and magnanimity.

And yet, though Fielding belongs with Shakespeare and Scott by virtue of his large, observant, kindly, and unspeculative common sense, he belongs also with the thoughtful critics of human life. Shakespeare excelled him in poetry, Scott in romance; but he excelled them both in irony. As he grew more reflective in later life, we know that Lucian and Swift came to be his supreme favorites. What other English writer ever conducted a whole periodical, as Fielding did *The Jacobite's Journal*, in the tone of irony? He found, indeed, that irony, so liable to be mistaken by dull people, is a dangerous trick for a writer, but he did not give it up until he had made himself one of the great ironists of the world. On the whole, nothing else contributes more to our sense of the capaciousness, the spaciousness, of Fielding's mind than his irony. To read Professor Cross's discussion of "Tom Jones," particularly those passages, based upon Mr. Dickson's investigations, which show how exact is the book's geography and how close-knit is the time-scheme, is to marvel at the memory and will and art which so massively built up the story. And yet, turning again to "Tom Jones" itself, we discover that this vast structure is held, almost as lightly as some trivial squib, in the deft, sure fingers of irony. One of the humanest of books, it is also, within its genial boundaries, one of the most thoughtful. He who would write a more thoughtful one must go above the level of ordinary reality to the more gorgeous region from which poets measure the whirling world with impassioned eyes; or to the dryer, thinner atmosphere from which angelic philosophers or deracinated cynics view with ethereal or sick contempt the insectile life of their poor kind.

At certain minor points, of course, some readers will take issue now and then with the conclusions of Professor Cross, but for the most part his work gives the impression that nothing too little and nothing too much has been said. One reader at least has paid Professor Cross the ultimate compliment of being reminded by him of the great eulogy Dryden pronounced upon Chaucer, a eulogy which, with a few verbal changes, may as well be applied to Fielding: "He is a perpetual Fountain of good Sense; learn'd in all Sciences; and therefore speaks properly on all Subjects: As he knew what to say, so he knows also when to leave off; a Continence which is practis'd by few Writers. . . . [Fielding] follow'd Nature everywhere; but was never so bold to go beyond her: And there is a great Difference of being *Poeta* and *nimis Poeta*, if we may believe *Catullus*, as much as betwixt a modest Behaviour and Affectation. . . . He must have been a Man of a most wonderful comprehensive Nature, because, as it has been truly observ'd of him, he has taken into the Compass of his [Novels] the various Manners and Humours (as we now call them) of the whole *English* Nation in his Age. Not a single Character has escap'd him. All his [Characters] are severally distinguish'd from each other: and not only in their Inclinations, but in their very Phisiognomies and Persons. . . . The Matter and Manner of their [Conversation], and of their [Speech] are so suited to their different Educations, Humours and Callings, that each of them would be improper in any other Mouth. Even the grave and serious Characters are distinguish'd by their several sorts of Gravity: Their Discourses are such as belong to their Age, their Calling, and their Breeding; such as are becoming of them, and of them only. Some of his Persons are Vicious, and some vertuous; some are unlearn'd or (as [Fielding] calls them) [Low], and some are Learn'd. Even the Ribaldry of the Low characters is different: [Trulliber], [Partridge], and [Black George] are several Men, and distinguished from each other, as much as the mincing Lady [Booby] and the broad-speaking [Mrs. Slipslop]. But enough of this: . . . 'Tis sufficient to say, according to the Proverb, that here is God's Plenty."

Our Commercialized Universities

The Higher Learning in America. A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men. By Thorstein Veblen. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $2.

MR. VEBLEN'S arraignment of the American universities is so complete, so unreserved, so confident in its finality, that it requires statement in the author's own vigorous words. The universities have failed utterly of their true end and aim, by reason of their control by business men, animated by a false competitive spirit, everywhere pursuing the shadow and losing the substance. Schoolmasters and narrow-visioned utilitarians infused with a barbarian pragmatism are bred by the system, and continue and intensify its futility. The clerical bias has been replaced by the business bias; both forsake the disinterested path of learning. Yet the avowed ideal remains; learning is tolerated, smuggled in, and dissimulated under some plausible pretexts of practicality. Neither professional schools nor disciplinary colleges belong in a university, whose sole purpose is to advance the higher learning. Experts in short-term political prestige have brought the money-changers into the temple and even look to the popular esteem of money-changing to give the traffic sanctity. Yet they continue to seek the prestige of the temple of learning. "The graver issues of academic policy which now tax the discretion of the directive powers, reduce themselves in the main to a question between the claims of science and scholarship on the one hand and those of business principles and pecuniary gain on the other hand."

"Business success is by common consent, and quite uncritically, taken to be conclusive evidence of wisdom even in matters that have no relation to business affairs." "Full of the same faith that business success 'answereth all things,' these business men . . . exercise full discretion in these matters with which they have no special familiarity." "The American business is a spirit of quietism, caution, compromise, collusion, and chicane," as America is "the land of the unearned increment." Justifying the control of universities by the large financial interests, they extend it to all matters, including those of utterly unrelated and sharply opposed animus, in which the true life of learning consists. The common argument that college learning unfits for business carries with it the converse that fitness for business has no relation to fitness for control of learning. The parallel implication, that what is of no use in business is not worth while, is less avowedly professed. To ignore or excuse the "surveillance of the academic work" which is exercised through the budget shows a strange lack of practical sense, while it in no way touches the futility and "ingenious folly" of the entire arrangement.

The members of the board select a president in their own image and impose him as a "captain of erudition" on a complacent and unconsulted faculty. For this autocratic individual "a modicum of scholarship and scholarly ideals" is a perquisite, and a combination of astuteness with a gift for popular appeal the chief requirement. The general result is a "wasteful defeat" of the university's purpose. The perversion runs far and wide, and cuts deep. The governing spirit of the institution is false. The competitive idea introduced from the business world rules everywhere and combines with the acceptance of the criterion of popular approval, counting upon a rhetorical appeal to the gallery. One university wastefully competes with another; catalogue pretensions ridiculously overstate facilities. Departments compete with one another for students; professors compete by way of class-rolls and truculence to superiors. Every item of the mechanism of teaching must be standardized and made to tell a statistical tale, which alone falls within the comprehension of the laity. The captains of erudition and their subordinates may know better, but they are either helpless or complacent. Their relation to the captain is simple: "They have eaten his bread, and it is for them to do his bidding." "The faculty is conceived as a body of employees,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hired to render certain services and turn out certain scheduled vendible results." To them is left inconsequential detail. Preferment goes to those affected by the same temper as directs the enterprise, and thus are recruited deans and henchmen and "the many committees-for-the-sifting-of-sawdust into which the faculty of a well administered university is organized."

The root source of the untoward development is the extraneous control. Its consequences are many. Under the "Keeper of the Tape and Sealing Wax" the imponderables and incommensurables of learning are spread upon the record in terms of units and hours; and bookkeeping rules supreme. Popularity and notoriety are assets; salesmanship is cultivated above workmanship. Advertising becomes an essential industry developing in the extreme to "a ravenous megalomania" prolonging "a shout into polysyllables." Cheapening the product by increasing the output is the maxim, ever recognizing that it is bad business to offer better goods than the market demands. Puerile "student activities," temporizing schools of commerce, vociferous university extension, showy architecture in bastard antique, scholars underpaid and overworked, diplomatic mischief-makers seeking crumbs of control, stultification and waste and inefficiency everywhere—not even substitution by way of compromise, but crude displacement and abject surrender.

The evil is concentrated, aided, abetted, and reënforced in the president, who exalts administrative frills and through his autocratic appointing power creates a faculty after his own image. With a boyish imitation of business enterprise, with "a serene and voluble loyalty to current conventions," this masquerading captain of erudition becomes "an itinerant dispensary of salutary verbiage" and the discourager, even the sterilizer, of learning, the agent of the angel of decay, rejoicing in his function, glorifying it, seeking the centre of the stage, and spreading perversion with every move—all in as uncritical and mixed a temper as this eclectic delineation. When more pointedly and colloquially expressed, the epithets gain in sincerity what they lack in elegance, until the eavesdropper upon confidential comment might well conclude that "the typical academic head, under these latterday conditions, will be a feeble-minded rogue." "With all due endeavor to avoid the appearance of a study in total depravity, the foregoing analysis has come, after all, to converge upon the growth and derivation of those peculiar ambiguities and obliquities that give character to the typical academic executive."

Yet the office rather than the man is to blame. "It is the duties of the office, not a run of infirmities peculiar to the incumbents of office, that make the outcome. Very much like that of the medicine-man, the office is one which will not abide a tolerant and ingenuous incumbent." For success in such an "enterprise in meretricious notoriety" implies less native gift and previous training than the simpler issue of submitting to the discipline and by natural drift conforming to the type. As for remedies, there are various ways of mitigating symptoms; the only radical cure is the dissolution of the "trust"-like university (which would hurt the feelings of the trustees), the abolition of the executive, and the reduction of administration to a minor place. Correctively, the removal of a futile control; constructively, the self-determination of faculties and professors; in brief, the placing of authority, with responsibility, in the faculty is the sole path of redemption.

It would be an entire misconception of Mr. Veblen's essay to counter its thrust by exposing its weaknesses and its exaggerations. It would be peculiarly impertinent to take the attitude tempting to many a professor, and reply that he personally is not suffering (much as the anti-suffragists of comfortable station disavow any inconvenience through the absence of the vote), and thus deny the relevancy of the thesis. Mr. Veblen is quite prepared to admit all manners and measures of "reservations and abatements," is careful to emphasize that the results may (under favorable circumstances do) approximate to a creditable consummation under the conditions that obtain. But, first as last, the trend of the system is in the wrong direction, even when tolerantly relieved by the inconsistency that refrains from exercising authority. First as last, no profession can worthily carry on its mission upon uncertain rations of "reservations and abatements." To move enthusiastically and vigorously a career must proceed upon sound inspiring principles, and enjoy the freedom of growth and service that can come only by self-direction. As Lowell put it, compromise makes a good umbrella, but a poor roof. The academic shelter is exposed to untoward forces, because the occupants are tenants on probation, when they should be landlords.

When all is said that may be said in extenuation and excuse, and all is done that may be done in mitigation and relief, the system of extraneous control under which American universities operate stands bare of defence and convicted of the serious charges that the Veblens and Cattells and many another less articulate protagonist of reform lay against it. The system, if not "ingeniously foolish," is at least strangely and cumulatively inept. Unquestionably, the commercializing—even admitting its inevitability in some measure—has been hastened and aggravated by the false spirit of concession, even the warm adoption of the programme which the academy should have resisted wisely and vigorously and well. "Good work, that is to say sufficiently good work to be worth while, requires a free hand and a free margin of time and energy." If the pursuit of learning is to furnish a career reasonably promising of achievement and satisfaction, it must cease to take on the character of an obstacle-race. An open highway on a firm foundation is indispensable; plodding through mud and sand discourages, the more so when it is the consequence of misguided engineering and an interfering desire for control. There is no consolation in the reflection that there are redeeming bits of roadway where the course, running through difficult country, has been left to the more expert. It is Mr. Veblen's merit that he has enunciated principles and presented a perspective; he has sketched the promised land that the present generation will not enter, but might have possessed. More than that: he has made it possible openly and honorably to state an adherence which has been invidiously interpreted as the evidence of a private grudge or a soured disposition. The utterly foolish injection of personal references and carping criticism into the momentous question of university control has made it almost impossible to discuss it calmly in academic circles. The local reference overshadows the objective consideration. The complacency of the profession in the presence of harrassing evils, the lack of professional spirit that stands up for a cause (for others less fortunate if not for oneself), the surrender of ideals to the lure of easement and preferment, the temptation of the mess of pottage: these qualities cannot be gainsaid, and invite the conclusion that such a temper deserves nothing better than the employeeship which it accepts.

The point at which one may legitimately take exception to Mr. Veblen's thesis is his conception of the desirable or necessary limitations of the professorial career, granted its primary devotion to the higher learning. In his assumption that the scholar desires to be or should be nothing more than a scholar, he will fail of a following. It is plainly uneconomical to cultivate scholarship and not use it to the full. Every man is something more than his profession; the scholar's influence in the community is a general asset. Many of the activities that a modern university calls upon the professor to perform—if he chances to have the ability—are helpful to his career. Versatility is not a lost gift, and the limitations of the specialist and the cloistering of the *Gelehrter* are not commendable products in this wide-awake world. Moreover, every practical man is ready to make concessions, and pay for his liberty. The scholar may well prefer to do so by way of collegiate work, accepting some measure of drudgery. But he agrees that he must not be given to do what will maim or hamper his main fitness, what will divert or endanger the broad possibility of his best talents. He rightfully demands stimulus as he goes, and an atmosphere that incites him to the optimum of endeavor. Many things contribute

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to that end; many more hinder. The issue is converged upon the function of trustees and the too expansive, too Prussianeering, executive. Mr. Veblen places them in the class of undesirable influences in the higher learning of America.

In illustration of the animus of learning, he cites the ingenious question of Benjamin Franklin: Of what use is a baby? Learning, like a baby, justifies itself; trustees and presidents do not. They exist (or are mistakenly permitted to exist) for the sake of a definite end; by that service they must be measured. Yet with all this granted, those sympathetic with the thesis will raise the issue whether the spirit of university control could not be decidedly altered by alteration of the temper, without abandoning the established instruments of control. Therein lie the practical hope and the adjustment to the *status quo*. The placing of a considerable group of faculty members on the board of control seems the simplest step to prevent the evils from growing worse; how far it will rectify them remains to be seen. It is frankly a compromise, and as such can find justification only as an umbrella, not as a permanent structure. To alter the figure: such shared direction will remove the feeling that the scholars are eating at the second table, which in fact they are. With so much of concession to those who insist that ways and means and balances of powers are the true ends of man, let the concluding emphasis of the book remain: that Mr. Verblen, like President Wilson, places himself with those who believe in principles first. In the reconstruction that is upon us, for political relations as for those of learning, that is the largest stake, the supreme issue. To Mr. Veblen belongs the glory, as yet not conspicuously acknowledged, of a leader in a momentous issue.

The Eternal Sophomore

Buck. By Charles D. Stewart. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $1.60.

Henry is Twenty. By Samuel Merwin. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. $1.50.

Common Cause. By Samuel Hopkins Adams. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $1.60.

FUNNY though it be, there are few things more touching in life than the spectacle of youth struggling out of the wooden chrysalis of its later teens, sloughing off its feeble conformities and ill-based conceit, and discovering painfully the real self that is capable of being and doing, not merely seeming and feeling. Mr. Tarkington has recently presented this comedy, rather coarsely, in "The Magnificent Ambersons," and Mr. Bennett, with finesse, in "The Roll-Call." Here are three other more or less whimsical interpretations of the same deathless phenomenon.

"Buck" is a cheerful portrait of a young American of the staving, successful kind, a youth with plenty of cheek and something in the way of character behind it. His father is a self-made man, now chief magnate of a little middle-western town. Buck is sent to the State University as a recognized station on the road of the younger generation. There he goes in for divinity as the biggest "snap" in the curriculum, and for football as a pursuit worthy of manhood. He is a "good mixer," with a keen interest in everything that concerns his fellow man, and he has a knack of turning his wide acquaintance to account in extraordinary ways—as, for example, in making his intimacy with a bartender the lever to keep the theological department, and especially his friend Professor Holt, in the university. His talents, however, are cribbed and confined within college bounds. A chance remark by his father is taken as a dare, and he gives notice that he is going out into the world to see what he can do to it. In Chicago he takes the first job that offers, as porter in a "moving" concern. His cheerfulness and efficiency soon make him the star of the outfit, but there are complications. He finds employment with an eccentric man of means who chooses to keep a livery stable. Follow divers amusing adventures in love and in affairs, with Buck always right side up and another move forward. The book is hardly more a "novel" than "David Harum" was, or Mr. Stewart's own "Fugitive Blacksmith." But its bits of philosophy and satire and humorous characterization go far towards making the reader indifferent, for the moment at least, to its defects as a story.

The lad in "Henry is Twenty" is of course the "Temperamental Henry" of Mr. Merwin's earlier chronicles. In his preface, "Of Patterns and Persons," the author does not show himself superior to the current affectation which says to the reader: "I know what you are used to in a novel—certain set episodes and characters, 'plots' and 'heroes.' I can't offer you these,—all I can offer is the real thing." It was a good while ago, after all, that the first professed "novel without a hero" was written. And surely "Sentimental Tommy" is not so thoroughly forgotten that Mr. Merwin need be surprised at his readers' interest in one whom he "has never found it easy to picture as a popular hero of fiction." As a matter of fact, the virtuous hero, the industrious apprentice hero, long ago yielded his precedence. Some of the most popular modern story-tellers, W. J. Locke, Booth Tarkington, Mr. Merwin himself, have habitually preferred the eccentric hero. So that when Mr. Merwin says of his Henry, "He isn't, of course, a hero at all. His weaknesses are too plain—the little evidences of vanity in him, his self-centered moments, his errant susceptibilities—and heroes can't have weaknesses," he is talking the emptiest nonsense, offering a strictly conventional lure of the current angler for popular favor. This story needed no such lure for any reader of intelligence. It is a very amusing study of the boy-man who is looked on as a freak by his neighbors and can only be justified from the romantic point of view either as a noble character (we almost said hero) or as a genius. The fatal thing for Mr. Tarkington's latest youth was that he was neither. Henry is a genius: unless we take Mr. Merwin's word for this, there is nothing in the story, romantically. And there is not much in it unless we accept the popular axiom that a genius is always an ass in the smaller concerns of life. Having assumed these slight premises, everything follows very pleasantly. After playing the young ass in his "home town" to the age of twenty, Henry, under the spur of love, produces a series of stories (ten of them in a night, if we recall the figures) that beat everything since Stevenson and Kipling. Incidentally, the country newspaper in which he has invested his all is saved to the town of Sunbury, Illinois, and Henry wins the girl,—the pretty, wistful, proud, old-fashioned girl who is usually waiting to reward this type of hero.

It would be interesting to have the opinion of the author of "Buck,"—also author of "Prussianizing Wisconsin" in the January *Atlantic*,—on "Common Cause." It is an uncommonly well-told story as a story, and this is to say a notable achievement for "a novel of the war in America." It undertakes nothing less than the interpretation of a half-Germanized American state, discreetly generalized as "Centralia," in process of approaching and facing the war. The weakness about most attempts of this kind has been their failure to focus this large vague sort of process in a concrete action. Here all the elements of larger interest are centred in the fortunes of a young journalist (roughly speaking, a compound of the "Buck" and "Henry" types), who will not knuckle down to racial or "vested" domination, and in the end, after some narrow squeaks, becomes the accepted champion of new and better forces in local politics and industry, and of a new ideal of Americanism. There is a girl, and she is less obviously lugged in than usual in this sort of novel; though the incident of her betrothal to a Prussian officer is an almost fatally obvious fiction. But in the main Mr. Adams has got away from his habitual tricks of whimsy and sentiment. His Jeremy Robson and several of his other characters are natural and human persons. He has his opinion of the peril of *Deutschthum*, and that opinion is embodied in his story, instead of camouflaged by it. His dialogue is extraordinarily good,—the real speech of America, or as close a rendering of it as may properly be attempted in print.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

THE fifth volume of T. Humphry Ward's "English Poets" (Macmillan; $1.10), has, like its predecessors, an advantage over most anthologies in that the selections are introduced by critical notices from the pens of well-known writers. The notices are generally shorter than in the earlier volumes, no doubt because there is more verse included in this one that is strictly minor in quality; and the names of the critics are somewhat less eminent. It will be remembered that two of Matthew Arnold's most admirable essays and two of Pater's were first published in former volumes as introductions to the selections from Gray and Keats, Coleridge and Rossetti, respectively. However, the names of Thomas Hardy, Edmund Gosse, J. W. Mackail, H. C. Beeching, John Drinkwater, Laurence Binyon, Sidney Colvin, and Sir Henry Newbolt sufficiently guarantee the excellence of the criticism. The selections from Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold are here reprinted from the appendix to the fourth volume, but the rest of the selections are, with few exceptions, from minor poets—Rupert Brooke, Lionel Johnson, Ernest Dowson, Richard Middleton, Francis Thompson, John Davidson, John Addington Symonds, William Johnson (Cory). Many readers will no doubt find this part of the anthology even more interesting than that devoted to Swinburne, Morris, and Christina Rossetti. One meets, and is glad to meet, many old favorites—"The Hound of Heaven," Dowson's "Cynara," Henley's so-called "Invictus," "Mimnermus in Church," and others; but one queries, "If 'Mimnermus,' why not 'Heraclitus'? If the 'Hound,' why not 'The Dead Cardinal'?" Lack of space is of course the answer, but that is hardly a sufficient reason for the omission of fourteen exquisite lines from Lionel Johnson's memorial to Pater, surely one of the most perfect bits of elegiac writing in modern poetry. We could have reconciled ourselves to a briefer selection from Stephen Phillips, as his editor, Sidney Colvin, seems uneasily aware; and we regret that a place could not have been found beside Brooke for his young brother-in-arms, Charles Hamilton Sorley, whose death John Masefield is said to have pronounced "the greatest loss sustained by English literature during the war." It is curious, by the way, that the place of Brooke's burial should still be incorrectly given. It is, of course, Scyros, not Imbros.

THE State law of North Carolina forbids the marriage of the feeble-minded, but imposes no penalty upon the clergyman or public official who knowingly performs such a ceremony. The State education law requires school attendance for only four months a year for children between the ages of eight and fourteen, with exemption in cases of poverty; since children are allowed to go to work at twelve years, it is possible and common for them to leave school each year at the end of four months and return the following year no further advanced in grade. "It never done me no harm" is the sentiment partly responsible for the discrepancies in North Carolina's provisions for children. But this State, which has possessed the unenviable reputation of being among the most backward in child protection, is waking up. There has been a growing realization among her more thoughtful citizens that the best hope for progress lies in giving children a clean bill of health, an intelligent plan of education, and freedom from premature work. The Conference for Social Service of the State last year invited the National Child Labor Committee to survey the conditions relating to child welfare and to make recommendations for legislative action this winter. The study was directed by W. H. Swift, and the report, "Child Welfare in North Carolina" (New York: National Child Labor Committee; $1) has just been published. It is the third of a series, the first two being based on surveys in Oklahoma and Alabama, and it is this fact that gives it its greatest significance. It forms part of a nation-wide movement, which started some years ago and has received tremendous impetus this year, for so-called "children's codes." This is an effort, in short, to coördinate and bring to a common standard of effectiveness all the laws relating to children within the State. For instance, under present laws, a child may be allowed to leave school at thirteen years and is yet prohibited from going to work before he is fourteen—a discrepancy bound to result in illegal and unregulated employment. The present volume, with its studies of delinquency and dependency, institutions, rural schools, child labor, and agriculture, should form a good basis for action in North Carolina, besides throwing light on the remedy for much ineffectiveness in law-making that is not, unfortunately, peculiar to that State.

THE key to the discursive delights of James Branch Cabell's book of essays, "Beyond Life" (McBride; $1.50), is to be found in his thesis that "romance has universally been the demiurgic and beneficent force, not merely in letters, but in everything that concerns mankind; and that 'realism,' with its teaching that the mile-stones along the road are as worthy of consideration as the goal, has always figured as man's chief enemy,"—this, and perhaps a fell determination to "get even" with certain critics of his previous works, extracts from whose damnatory reviews he joyously prints at the end of the volume. It is characteristic of Mr. Cabell's subtle methods that he scorns to attack these enemies directly. He takes the more devious course of attacking them through their idols. Here is a typical extract from his observations on Greek art: "It is hardly necessary to point out that the Greeks shared few of our delusions about 'decency': for, of course, they had no more moral aversion to a man's appearing naked in the street than to a toad's doing so, and objected simply on the ground that both were ugly. So they resolutely wrote about—and carved and painted, for that matter—men as they ought to be, doing such things as it would be gratifying for men to do if these feats were humanly possible." Of Mr. Cabell's unflinching iconoclasm, the following is a fair example: "It may happen, indeed, that the day will never dawn wherein honest persons may without incurring the suspicion of illiteracy or posturing admit the longwinded drivel of 'The Life and Strange Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner' to be commensurate with the title; and point out that the erotic misdemeanors of Tom Jones are, after all, too few and too inadequately detailed to prevent his biography being tiresome."

ON New Year's Day, 1754, that fastidious and amiable bachelor, William Shenstone presented to Mary Cutler, presumably the housekeeper at his Horatian estate, the Leastowes, near Birmingham, a little manuscript volume embellished by water-color paintings and containing forty-seven of his poems and several Latin inscriptions. After drifting for a century and a half through we know not what waters of ownership, the manuscript fell into the hands of that kindliest of collectors, Professor George Herbert Palmer. Through his aid it became the basis of a thesis written by Miss Alice I. Hazeltine as a candidate for the M. A. degree at Wellesley in 1913. Portions of the manuscript, together with a survey of the work and significance of Shenstone, have at length been published—"A Study of William Shenstone and of his Critics" (Banta). Students of eighteenth century literature may in consequence consult fifteen Shenstonian poems never before printed, four or five Latin inscriptions, and versions of several known poems which differ considerably from the published form. The new pieces, though interesting and characteristic, will not materially affect the rank of the poet. The most prettily turned of them is "The Roses reconcil'd," written in a manner that reminds one of Matthew Prior. But the general discussion of Shenstone occupies the greater part of the volume. Miss Hazeltine admits that he was not a great man and that he does not belong to a great period. On the other hand, she maintains not only that he represents his age in an unusual degree, but also that he is undeserving of the *ex cathedra* condemnation of Johnson and of the slighting comments attributed, perhaps wrongly, to Gray. She points out the tendency of his critics to confine themselves

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to single aspects of his work, and undertakes in opposition thereto "to give a well-rounded appreciation of this versatile man, so likable and so true in everything that he did." While one might have wished her to dwell longer on his celebrated inscriptions and his invaluable assistance to Percy in the preparation of the "Reliques," she considers sanely and competently his character, his landscape gardening, his poetry, his essays, his letters, and his literary criticism. The most glaring defect of her work is her incautious quotation from poets other than Shenstone: with her, Gray's flower born to blush unseen is specified as a rose, and Wordsworth's meanest flower that blows is required to *bring* rather than to *give* deep thoughts, though the rhyme halt for't.

IN the opinion of Edward S. Drown, as expressed in "God's Responsibility for the War" (Macmillan; 60 cents), God is in some sense at present before the judgment seat of humanity in the matter of His responsibility for the war. The question before the court is, in fact, only the old problem of God's tolerance of evil; it is new merely in its intensity. The problem is not implicit in the idea of God; there may be many Gods, or God may be confessedly limited in power, and opposed by an original principle of evil, as in the ancient religion of Persia. If either of these hypotheses is true, then, of course, there is no difficulty. The problem is, however, implicit in the Christian idea of God as uniting divine power and divine goodness. "If there is one God, if He is all-powerful and all-good, how can we explain evil? That is the mystery. It is the direct product of the Christian idea of God." The difficulty, according to our author, may be stated thus: "If God be of supreme power, cannot He stop the suffering of the world? If He be of supreme goodness, will He not do so? Is it not a clear case that God either will not or cannot destroy the evil of the world? . . . He is accused either of impotence or wickedness. Convicted of either, He ceases to be the Christian God. God is put on trial for His life." The problem is of course solved if we assume, with John Stuart Mill and William James, that God's power is indeed limited. With this view the author is much in sympathy —in fact, he practically adopts it in the end. If we have to choose, he says, between God's omnipotence and His love, who would not rather abandon His omnipotence? This he finally does when he enunciates his theory of "the Christian God of love, working out His purposes in a universe of the free sons of God, and meeting with all the difficulties that a free universe presents."

DURING the first two years of the great war, foreign correspondents in Russia had the alternative either of chanting panegyrics to the Czaristic régime or of keeping silent. Mr. M. Philips Price, representing the *Manchester Guardian*, naturally refused to join the chorus of the Northcliffe press; and being unable to report on the atrocities committed by the autocratic Government at the front and in the rear, he betook himself to Asiatic Russia, "rather than bury his conscience in Europe." As a result of his observations in northern Persia, Armenia, the Caucasus, and Khurdistan, we now have a compact volume, "War and Revolution in Asiatic Russia" (Macmillan; $2). While the account of the military expeditions may interest a limited circle of readers, the chapters on the Armenian question, the nationalistic complications in the Caucasus, and the effects of the Russian revolution in Asia have a universal and timely value. Mr. Price has treated his delicate and complex subject with rare tact and conscientiousness. His impartial presentation of the case of the Armenians, of the Khurds, of the Tartars, of the Georgians, and of the other elements forming that international cauldron seething between Trans-Caucasia and Mesopotamia, strengthens our conviction of the fact that the differences among those nationalities are largely due to the *divide et impera* policy of their imperialistic sovereigns and neighbors. The passing of Russian and, let us hope, of Turkish imperialism may remove the chief cause for Armenian-Tartar-Khurd-Georgian massacres.

Drama

Melpomene Under the Bolsheviks

PANEM et circences! was the cry of the Romans under the Cæsars. The Bolshevik rulers of Russia, whose knowledge of history, both ancient and modern, cannot be doubted, remember that historic lesson, but since they cannot supply abundant food they compensate the citizens of the Soviet Republic by providing a larger dose of amusement.

Since their accession to power in November, 1917, the Bolsheviks have nationalized industries, banks and mines, but among the few enterprises that still remain in private hands are many theatres, music halls, and other places of amusement. Even the former Imperial Opera and Imperial Ballet, the pride of the late Czar, continued their performances after the Bolshevik *coup de état*. The same *prima donna* and *prima balerina*, who by melodious voice and supple limbs had charmed the ears and eyes of the autocrat of all the Russias, now exhibited their talents before a mixed audience, and when they bowed their acknowledgments to their cheering admirers they faced a motley assemblage of people in workmen's clothes and sailors' uniforms loudly expressing their approval from the cushioned depths of the Imperial box in the centre. The writer had the pleasure of witnessing a performance of the "Sleeping Princess," a ballet of oriental splendor, while sitting in a box which had been graced by the presence of the Grand Duchesses. When I reached Moscow, early in March, 1918, regular subscription performances were being given at the Grand Theatre, with opera and ballet alternating. The stage decorations were even more sumptuous than in Petrograd, the same conductor led the erstwhile Imperial orchestra, and no change was noticeable. The only apparent difference, both in Moscow and Petrograd, was the almost total absence of jewels and other personal ornaments, which the ladies were evidently afraid to wear. Stiff masculine shirt-bosoms were not in great evidence, but that might be explained by the scarcity of starch and lack of electric power in the laundries, as the people attending those performances were distinctly of the "bourgeois" type and could by no stretch of imagination be classed as proletarians. Deprived of their automobiles, which were either requisitioned or else rendered useless by the lack of gasoline, they came to the Opera in a *likhatch*, a hired cab of immaculate appearance, drawn by a spirited, full-blooded horse. That showed that they had not been entirely dispossessed by the Bolsheviks, as the charge for a short ride in one of those cabs was twenty-five rubles, whereas an ordinary cab could be had for ten. Their possession of earthly treasure was also evidenced by the numerous glasses of tea they consumed during

Every Book
advertised in this magazine (with possibly a few exceptions) is to be had on its day of publication at
Brentano's
Book Store
PROMPT ATTENTION GIVEN ALL MAIL ORDERS
Broadway at Ninth Street
NEW YORK AND IN PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the intermissions, accompanying each glass with a couple of little almond cakes or tiny, one-bite sandwiches at two rubles apiece.

To enable the workingman to hear opera at a reasonable cost the Moscow Soviet authorities took charge of a private opera house on Bolshaya Dmitrovka, near the Grand Theatre, and converted it into a veritable proletarian establishment. By that I do not mean to say that its productions and artistic management were below the high standard of the Grand. On the contrary, some operas were staged even better, as, for example, the "Queen of Spades" ("Pique Dame"), by Tchaikowsky (which the Russians seem to like as much as Americans do "Aida" or "Pagliacci"), was produced with entirely new scenery and some innovations which added to its excellence. One was struck there by the total absence of "bourgeois" elements. It was evidently considered beneath a gentleman's dignity to attend a performance at the Soviet Theatre, as it was styled. The audience was made up entirely of workmen with their wives, young factory gallants with their sweethearts, and a sprinkling of soldiers and sailors. The men were dressed in high boots and blue blouses, with an occasional soft white collar; the women wore kerchiefs on their heads, and a few had gay-colored scarfs thrown over their sturdy shoulders. Some of them, particularly the women, were there for the first time in their lives. They took seats without consulting their tickets, which may have been due as much to their ignorance of theatrical etiquette as to their inability to read. When the lawful possessors of those seats came and asserted their rights, much to the novices' confusion, they reluctantly changed places, but not without a mild protest against undue interference with their right of amusement. They exchanged lively comment during the entire performance, admiring the *prima donna's* dress or the antics of some humorous character. The faulty notes of the celebrated tenor engaged by the Soviet did not detract from their enjoyment.

On Sundays and holidays the National Government arranged concerts in the Kremlin, in one of the ancient halls of that historic place. Singers of national reputation, ballet dancers from the Grand Theatre and its orchestra, performed before an exclusive audience of Soviet officials and their families, Lettish soldiers stationed in the Kremlin, and other Bolsheviks. No outsiders were admitted to these concerts which were usually preceded by a short address by Trotzky, Commissioner of War and Navy. One Sunday I went to the little booth near the Kremlin gate and asked for a ticket.

"Vash partyini biléttе, továrishtch?" (your party card, comrade?) queried the man inside. When I explained that I was an American correspondent, he smilingly informed me that tickets were sold only to members of the Bolshevik party. I produced my official pass which instructed all the Soviets in the Republic to render me assistance in the performance of my duties, but although the man was duly impressed, he said he had no right to break the rule and sell me a ticket. Thus ended my unsuccessful attempt to attend a Kremlin concert.

The Bolsheviks did not interfere with the internal administration of the former Imperial theatres. Following the general plan of committee management adopted throughout Russia after the Revolution, superfluous administrative offices were abolished and the singers and actors themselves managed theatrical affairs. The only appointive officers were the Director-General of National Theatres and stage or art directors. Last summer the celebrated Russian singer Chaliapin was appointed Art Director of the National Opera, and the newspapers reported that his salary was to be 180,000 rubles a year. It is not to be doubted that under his management the opera will become popular in the broad sense of the word. His genius and his immense popularity will go a long way toward making opera a national institution in Russia. Chaliapin's unrivalled performances of "Boris Godounoff," "Prince Igor," and other musical dramas of historic significance have gained for him a unique reputation among the Russian people. His appearances at the People's Theatre in Petrograd were artistic events and even the bourgeois flocked to the hall which was densely packed with workmen and soldiers. He once sang at a concert to an exclusively workmen's audience, some twelve thousand of them, and received an ovation which moved him to tears. He who has sung before many an Imperial audience in days gone by confessed later that that was the greatest moment in his life.

When I returned to Petrograd at the end of August, cholera was still lingering there, but that did not deter Chaliapin from planning the repertory for the new season which was to have opened early in September. Of the two National Opera Houses in Petrograd, the Maryinsky Theatre was to produce grand opera, such as "Boris Godounoff," "Prince Igor" (with Chaliapin in the leading rôles) and other standard Russian, German, and French works, while the Mikhailovsky Theatre was to give a lighter repertory of popular operas and operettas.

Nor did the Soviet Government confine its attention to opera. The former Imperial, now National, dramatic theatres were also making elaborate preparations for the season. Their repertory, planned by a committee of well-known actors and playwrights, Maxim Gorky being one of them, included a wide range of plays, from the classical Russian comedy "Misfortune from Intelligence" by Griboyedoff to Edmond Rostand's "La Samaritaine," whose production was heretofore forbidden in Russia. One of the changes made in the Alexandrinsky Theatre was the engagement of a woman, Stravinskaya, as stage director. She is a talented actress and the first woman to hold such a post in the National theatres.

Maxim Gorky, the new Commissioner of Public Education, in whose sphere the arts are included, is devoting much energy to the education of the people through the medium of the stage, legitimate and "movies" as well. He has created a special cinematograph department which will produce films of the best works of Russian and foreign authors, as well as pictures of the revolutionary phases of Russian life and the progress of the Russian working class. This department also arranges lectures in the "movie" theatres. One such theatre is in the Winter Palace, where performances accompanied by lectures are given four times a week. They are largely attended, and the appreciation of the audiences may be judged from the circumstance that they frequently present the lecturers with loaves of black bread, the most precious thing in Petrograd.

The capacity of the Russians for amusement, even in these troublous times, is truly marvellous. In the several amusement parks in Moscow one could have his choice between a standard opera or operetta in one theatre, a drama or comedy in another, a vaudeville performance with a gypsy chorus in a third, and an open-air entertainment, with singing, dancing, and acrobatics. Lovers of music were attracted to one of those parks by the splendid symphony concerts by the orchestra from the Grand Theatre, twice weekly. All those places were always filled, and when some operatic or dramatic "star" was scheduled to appear one could not get a ticket weeks in advance.

The reason that the theatrical phase of Russian life has not suffered from the radical governmental changes in the last two years lies in the circumstance that artists and actors are wholly absorbed by their stage activities and do not engage in politics. Even the vaudeville man with his aptitude for making politics a source of witticisms steers clear of that course. The nearest approach to criticism of the Government's suppression of newspapers I heard once at the "Bat," a first-class music hall in Moscow. "We were fighting and shouting for freedom of the press," said the manager in one of his short addresses to the audience, "but when we obtained that freedom we suddenly grew silent. But," he added, "we do not mean to discuss politics here. This is a place where people come to amuse themselves." The audience laughed, and a man shouted that that was discussing politics. The manager smilingly countered that he was simply remarking on the fickleness of human nature, which evoked general laughter and soothed the ruffled feelings of the protestant.

GREGORY YARROS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

Foreign Borrowings Here

BANKERS and business men of various foreign countries are establishing credits in the United States as a resource in connection with the effort to purchase American produce and merchandise. These loans are taking the form of acceptance credits and will in all probability aggregate a large amount. One arrangement has provided for a group of Belgian banks a credit of $50,000,000, with the understanding that the proceeds of these credits should be expended in the United States. A similar stipulation has been made in most similar operations. A like credit for $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 will probably be granted to Denmark, and it is quite possible that $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 will be put at the disposal of Italy in the same way. Other countries which are badly in need of American produce or merchandise may be expected to resort to this convenient form of short-term financing.

One of its advantages has to do with the availability of the acceptance bills for rediscount purposes with the Federal Reserve Banks. This movement is another indication of the benefits resulting from the development of the acceptance system in this country. It is not unusual for some large banks and trust companies of the United States to hold in their portfolios from $25,000,000 to $75,000,000 of acceptances of other banks. Many institutions have come to regard these acceptance credits as their first line of reserve. One reason for this is that acceptance bills have a ready market and in addition are always available as the basis for loans from the Federal Reserve Banks.

This holding of acceptances has come about since the organization of the Federal Reserve System and the amendments to the Federal Reserve Act encouraging more liberal use of acceptances.

In the case of many of these credit arrangements recently entered into provision was made for three successive renewals of the loans, if the borrower desired, at the end of successive ninety-day periods. This provision made these loans run for one year and because of their short maturity made them acceptable for temporary investment to the large class of banking institutions in this country which usually seek liquid investments. The indications are, therefore, that many of the expenditures in the United States by foreign Governments and industrial interests will be financed through the use of these extremely convenient and safe credit instruments.

Another operation of a somewhat similar nature has been the establishment of a $5,000,000 gold deposit by the Republic of Bolivia with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. It is possible that this deposit will be increased if trade conditions should warrant it. The National Bank of Bolivia is enabled to issue currency against the deposit, and thus to reimburse Bolivian merchants by means of the new currency so issued. Similar credits have been established in this city for the account of Argentina and Peru. The need of making a physical transfer of the gold is obviated in cases where special deposits have been made with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

War complications and the extraordinary financial expedients which have resulted from them have forced this country to adopt a number of novel measures, which have been made possible only by the valuable facilities provided through the Federal Reserve Banking System. The probability is that these credit arrangements will be of great service to American financial interests in providing for the development of American commerce with foreign countries, and that the coming twelve months of unusual foreign trade development will see a high development of the acceptance system.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Chinard, Gilbert. Chateaubriand: Les Natchez, Livres I et II. University of California Press.

Paltsits, Victor H. Papers and Proceedings of the Joseph Rodman Drake Memorial Celebration. Lancaster: New Era Printing Company.

Price, Lawrence M. English-German Literary Influences. Part I. Bibliography. University of California Press.

Torr, Cecil. Small Talk at Wreyland. Putnam. $2.50.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Leonard, R. M., editor. The Poetry of Peace. Oxford University Press. $1.60.

Tudor, Marie. The Winged Spirit. Putnam. $1.50.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Botchkareva, Maria. Yashka: My Life as Peasant, Officer, and Exile. Stokes. $2.

Fuller, Mary B. In the Time of Sir John Eliot. Smith College Studies in History.

Hassard, Albert P. A New Light on Lord Macaulay. Toronto: Rockingham Press. 75 cents.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Anonymous. Self-Determination for India. London: Indian Home Rule League Office.

Halstead, William R. The Tragedy of Labor. Abingdon Press. 50 cts.

Overlach, T. W. Foreign Financial Control in China. Macmillan. $2.

Sidebotham, Herbert. England and Palestine. London: Constable.

THE WAR

Kirkpatrick, F. A. South America and the War. Putnam. $1.50.

Pollock, John. War and Revolution in Russia. London: Constable.

Potter, Frank H. The Naval Reserve. Holt. $1.35.

The Peace President

By WILLIAM ARCHER

An English estimate of President Wilson which considers him as a man, a writer, an historian, a politician, and as the great figure of the final phase of the world war and the peace settlement.

Just ready, $1.00 net

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St, New York City

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

To understand WORLD POLITICS *read:*

The Aims of Labour *by* Arthur Henderson, M. P. ($1.00).

Ireland: A Study in Nationalism *by* Francis Hackett. ($2.00).

Jean Jaurès *by* Margaret Pease. ($1.00).

How Diplomats Make War *by* Francis Neilson. ($1.50).

Young India *by* Lajpat Rai. ($1.50).

B. W. HUEBSCH *Publisher* NEW YORK

MEMORIES GRAVE AND GAY

BY FLORENCE HOWE HALL

The daughter of Julia Ward Howe here tells the story of her interesting life. $3.50

HARPER & BROTHERS

Established 1817.

THE MODERN LIBRARY

OF THE WORLD'S BEST BOOKS

Sixty-four titles now published.

Only 70c. a volume. Catalogue on request.

BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1919 No. 2799

Socialist Labor Organization in Italy

By ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

AT the outbreak of the war there were, according to Government figures, nearly nine hundred thousand organized workers in Italy in industry and agriculture. This is about one-seventh of the wage-earning population, which is roughly six and one-half million people (2,000,000 industrial; 4,500,000 agricultural), in an active population (over 10 years of age) of twenty-eight millions and a total population of thirty-six millions.

By no means all these organized laborers adhere to Marxian or syndicalistic principles. The Catholic unions, which rarely unite with revolutionary agitation, account for approximately one hundred and twenty thousand workers. The independent or isolated organizations claim about two hundred and fifty thousand more. This reduces the revolutionary *bloc* to something over five hundred thousand, or less than one-tenth, of the Italian proletariat, of whom about four hundred thousand are affiliated with the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro* (the C. G. L.) and about one hundred thousand with the *Unione Sindacale Italiana* or Syndicalist Union.

What distinguishes the syndicalists from all the other groups is their absolute rejection of political action, and their insistence of fighting for nothing short of what is known as the maximum programme, the abolition of capitalism and the "dictatorship of the proletariat." The isolated or independent unions, on the other hand, take toward political questions an attitude quite similar to that of the American Federation of Labor. They prefer to limit their official operations to the industrial or agricultural fields. In general they aim at the economic and social betterment of the workers, advocating such reforms as are covered by the formula of "fair play" between labor and capital. They do not supervise the political affiliations of their members, who are left free to vote any ticket they choose.

Still another attitude toward politics is that of the labor majority, the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro*. This, hitherto the representative organization of Italian labor, has borrowed from syndicalism the principle of industrial organization. Its smallest unit is the local trade or professional union. The local unions expand and centralize in two different ways. They create first of all the provincial and national trade federations, such as the Iron-Workers Federation, the Builders Federation, and the Hotel Workers Federation. These are the characteristic as well as the most powerful separate organs developed by Italian labor, inasmuch as any one of them can temporarily paralyze the whole mechanism of the state. The locals of all the different trades unite in each town in a common local organization called the labor chamber (*camera del lavoro*), exactly equivalent to the French *bourse du travail*. The C. G. L. is the national unit or central coördinating organ of the national trade federations, the provincial trade federations, and the chambers of labor, all of which are represented jointly and separately. As regards internal solidarity, it should be observed that Italy is an agricultural nation in proportions of about two to one. Nine million people live exclusively on the proceeds of agriculture against less than five million who live on the proceeds of industry. Nevertheless, the majority of the C. G. L. is formed by the industrial workers, the Agricultural Federation accounting for not more than one hundred and fifty thousand members.

The C. G. L. accepts the principle of political action only for the realization of its minimum program. It agrees with the syndicalists in looking ultimately to social revolution, to the substitution of its own organization for the present state mechanism of the constitutional monarchy. But meanwhile, as a matter of tactic and strategy, it would improve the condition of the workers by certain minor reforms of an economic, social, and educational nature. These reforms, it thinks, can be wrung by political action from the Government as at present constituted. The C. G. L. does not unite but rather coöperates and works in harmony with the Italian Socialist party, the *Partito Socialisto Italiano*, known since the early part of the war as the "official" Socialist party.

The *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro* is composed of working men and women exclusively. The Socialist party, however, has a middle class following, and is in fact often led by lawyers, doctors, and professors, with an occasional straggler from industrial capitalism itself. Before the last elections (1913) the party boasted a paid membership of fifty-eight thousand. It polled almost exactly a million votes, and won forty-four seats in a Parliament of four hundred and sixty-nine. These deputies, led by the orators Turati, Treves, and Modigliani, constitute the revolutionary Parliamentary group. This group designates a committee to sit, with the officers of the Socialist party, in joint council with the executive committee of the C. G. L. The coöperation between the party and the Federation extends even further. In the last elections the Socialists gained control of between thirty and forty communal Governments. President Wilson, for instance, was welcomed at Milan by a Socialist mayor, Caldara, and a majority Socialist city council. These local Governments have, during the war, organized the aggressive and unruly League of the Socialist Communes, which also sends a special representation to joint executive sessions with the C. G. L. Such a joint session will thus contain representatives of a large number of autonomous bodies: the executive committee of the C. G. L.; that of the Socialist party; the Parliamentary group; the Agricultural Federation; and the League of the Socialist Communes. Separate representation is accorded also to the important Federation of Railway Workers. Each develops an independent agitation of its own, but takes its general policy from the common board of strategy.

A "free lance" occasionally present at these joint sessions

EDUCATION LIBRARY
COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the editor of *Avanti*, the Socialist-labor daily. The former "free lance" was Serrati, whom the reaction from the Caporetto disaster sent, fiery and uncowed, to jail. A typical meeting of this council would show as familiar figures: Lodovico d'Aragona, secretary of the C. G. L., a clever diplomat who has successfully surmounted for his organization all the tendencies toward disintegration that have threatened the revolutionary movement since the war began; Argentina Altobelli, secretary of the Agricultural Federation, who symbolizes the proletarian feminist revolt, directs the extensive economic research bureaus of the C. G. L., and is one of the best informed persons on the proletarian aspects of social and economic questions in Italy; Lazari, secretary of the Socialist party, whose shrewdness may be measured by the extreme difficulty experienced by the Government in bringing his subversive propoganda within the reach of the Department of Justice; Turati, an elegant and learned orator, editor of the *Critica Sociale*, who represents the broadest political vision of the group, as well as its keenest analytical powers, and who is, by virtue of his prestige with all classes in the nation, a nexus between revolutionary emotion and liberal thought in Italy. Around these stand others, such as Buozzi and Bombacci, representatives of the militant subversive spirit; Musatti, a veteran of political Soicalist warfare in clerical Venice; and exponents of more moderate tendencies such as Treves and Modigliani.

This central committee exercises influence in Italy in a number of directions. One of its main functions is internal discipline. Over the national trade federations and the local unions its supervision acts to maintain the balance between local or trade operations and the general labor and political situation. One ancient characteristic of the Italian populace has been the facile contagion of its rebellious spirit. The C. G. L. is constantly on guard to circumscribe industrial disturbances, to prevent ill-considered outbreaks that may for the sake of local advantage transform agitation into warfare and compromise the general cause of revolution. It maintains sympathetic relations with the Syndicalist Union, though that sympathy is not always requited in the same degree. It often admits delegations from the Union to its assemblies. It never actually coöperates, however, unless the Union subordinates itself to the direction of the C. G. L. On the other hand it assumes inquisitorial authority over the Parliamentary group, jealously inspecting concessions to moderate ideas, preserving the Marxian orthodoxy of Parliamentary utterances, and evaluating the political efforts of the deputies whom it has supported at the polls. The spectacular episodes of Socialist-labor history occur in this fashion: some celebrity breaks with, or is expelled from the party; or a strike sometimes gets beyond control, and a public crisis, like that of June, 1914, results.

Little public attention was paid to the more routine activities of social organization performed by the C. G. L. and its coöperating groups. Working through the labor chambers particularly it maintains its own insurance, relief, and savings funds, and it operates its propaganda from a central budget. It conducts frequent researches, summarized in oral reports to its conventions, and printed and circulated through its membership. It maintains its own employment bureaus to facilitate the movement and insure the steady work of its adherents. While it has never risked the perilous adventure of embarking exclusively on coöperative agriculture and industry, the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro* has nevertheless taken up coöperative production on a considerable scale, and even more extensively coöperative distribution and consumption. This movement is not, of course, coextensive in Italy with the labor agitation. It has been encouraged by middle class elements, and by the Catholics and independent unions. The C. G. L. contents itself with organizing cooperatives among the revolutionaries already affiliated with the labor chambers. The coöperative method adapts itself best to the agricultural field. It is among the agriculturalists that revolutionary coöperatives are most numerous, and the progressive settlement of the land question during the coming reconstruction will doubtless greatly increase their number. Eventually the C. G. L. may have a coöperative organization of consumers, exactly parallel to its present industrial productive organization. But the situation is theoretically very complex. As producers, the workingmen may definitely set themselves apart from the rest of the population, and against the employers. This is good orthodox class-struggle doctrine. As consumers, however, they unite in interests with the whole mass of the nation. It is doubtful wisdom, in the opinion of some leaders, to complicate the problem of industrial democracy, or government by producers, with the common problem of liberal democracy which means government by consumers.

It will be seen that the *bloc* of revolutionary energies represented by the concordant action of the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro* and the Socialist party is a compromise between syndicalistic organization and political action, realized through a general acceptance of the Communist Manifesto of Marx. This has been the theoretical situation in Italy since 1892, when the Socialist party definitely broke with anarchism and syndicalism. The present organization goes back to 1906. Since then, in 1907 and in 1913, the issue between revolutionary Socialism and evolutionary or "reformist" Socialism, or socialistic liberalism was drawn. First Enrico Ferri and then Leonida Bissolati left the Socialist party. The Reformist Socialist party of Mr. Bissolati was established for the elections of 1913. Between Reformists and Independents, there are twenty-five deputies in Parliament.

The war provided one more test, with a resulting "purification," of the revolutionary, Marxian, official, majority, socialistic group represented by the C. G. L. and the Socialist party. The purely material factors working in war time against the majority organization may be gauged at their strongest in the experience of the Builders' Federation of Romagna, which saw its paying membership reduced from forty-five thousand to less than five thousand. This was in a trade seriously affected by the war. But in other trades, such as iron-working and shoemaking, made more prosperous by the war, there were great translocations of labor, and while thousands of "class conscious" workers went off to the front, their places and the new places created by increased industrial production (92.4 per cent. in Milan, a typical centre), were taken by women, by men from other trades, and by agriculturalists. The war, in other words, was singularly disturbing to the trade organizations, and times were especially difficult for starting a propaganda for reorganization. While, in this turmoil, it is hard to measure the exact degree of operation of the patriotic sentiment on the masses, it was probably greater than the stolid consistency of the directing committees would indicate, but certainly less than the Government looked for when, with the approval of the conservative and liberal press, the new twin organizations called the Italian Federation of Workers and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italian Socialist Union were brought into being, in opposition to the C. G. L. and the Socialist party.

Whereas the latter *bloc*, faithful to the class struggle theory, coöperates with moderates and conservatives neither in measures of war nor in measures of peace, a few of its members early joined the local "fasci" or coalition Governments to supervise food distribution and relief. Later this theory of coöperation was extended to the political field, but on a small scale. Turati, formerly considered a "reformist of the left" and now a "revolutionary of the right" may have seemed to balance for a moment on matters of policy; but he was never really in danger of surrendering to the war spirit. The only desertion of note was that of Alceste de Ambris, the founder of the "Republic of Pinocchio" at Parma, a violent direct actionist, who, in four years swung from pure syndicalism to a position favoring Government repression of anti-war Socialism, and ended by heading a war mission to the United States.

The new organizations would have had worse luck than they have had, if their support depended only upon secessionists from the C. G. L. and the Socialist party. As a matter of fact, the moment after the Caporetto defeat seemed favorable for the creation of a non-revolutionary Socialist labor movement in Italy along the lines of the American Federation, if a coalition could be effected between the Reformist and Independent Socialist groups and the independent and isolated labor unions. This scheme took form last spring. At the recent (January) convention of the Italian Federation of Workingmen, a membership of one hundred and sixty-two thousand was claimed by adding the constituencies of the delegates. There were represented at this congress fifteen syndicate unions, two national federations, three provincial federations, thirteen labor chambers, and eighteen independent unions. Meanwhile the Italian Socialist Union was absorbing the Reformist Socialist party of Mr. Bissolati.

The Italian Federation has laid out an impressive scheme of organization. Its relation to the Socialist Union is supposed to be similar to that of the C. G. L. to the Socialist party. On the other hand, its basic principle is non-intervention in politics, though it favors political action. In this it squares with our A. F. of L. While the conservative and liberal press of Italy was supporting the Italian Federation, much as the American press supported and applauded Mr. Gompers, the C. G. L. was claiming that the new organization existed largely on paper. It is too early to estimate its real or permanent strength. Its leaders complain that while the Government looks with deference upon the demands of the C. G. L., it visits the agitation of the Italian Federation with merciless repression. Mr. Berenini and Bonomi openly flouted the Socialist Union's decision against socialistic coöperation with the present reconstituted Government.

But even if we hold, with their opponents, that the new Federation is a federation of leaders, and the new Union a committee of directors without any following to direct, and even if we recognize that during the war the formation of these groups caused only surface abrasions in the organization of the C. G. L. and the Socialist party, the near future may see a very material growth in their influence on the Italian working population. In December a very clear division developed in the C. G. L. and the Socialist party, between the supporters of immediate revolution and those who follow the old reformist ideas. Turati, objecting to the proclamation of a proletarian "constituent assembly" to inaugurate a Soviet Republic in Italy, spoke of the possibility of a break between the two sections. In this event, we should without any doubt witness a reconciliation between the old reformists of Bissolati and the more radical reformists still affiliated with the revolutionary *bloc*. The unknown quantity here is the rank and file proletariat itself. How far will the Italian populace as a whole be infected with the psychology of victory? When the C. G. L. returns to direct contact with workers who have fought victoriously at the front, or worked in conditions of unprecedented prosperity behind the lines, how much enthusiasm will it find for an openly subversive propaganda? If the problems of reconstruction are solved satisfactorily by the Government, the agitation for revolution will find little support, and the reformists will remain within the C. G. L. If not, the C. G. L. will be confronted with a serious crisis. It will either "go to the left" or sacrifice its leadership to the more aggressive Syndicalist Union. In the one event it will lose its present reformist support; in the other it will lose its principal reason for existence and succumb to the moderate tendencies represented by the new Socialist Union and the new Federation of Workers. The one thing certain at present is that the leaders of the revolutionary *bloc* will have to face the issue of peace with even greater prudence than they developed in successfully piloting the revolutionary movement through the trying issues of war.

The New System of German Elections

By CHARLES HENRY HUBERICH and RICHARD KING

IN its proclamation of November 12, 1918, the German Provisional Government declared that all elections should thereafter be held on the basis of equal, secret, direct, and universal suffrage, under a system of proportional voting. The proclamation extended the suffrage to all men and women over twenty years of age, the details to be fixed by subsequent legislation. Except for the adoption of woman's suffrage this proclamation announces no principles that have not been applied under the older German election laws, national or state. In addition to establishing the basis of national suffrage, its chief value lies in furnishing the groundwork for a unification of the state election laws.

These state laws differed widely under the old régime. In Bavaria, Baden, Oldenburg, and Alsace-Lorraine, equal, secret, and direct manhood suffrage prevailed, with the additional requirement, in Bavaria, of the payment of direct taxes. Saxe-Coburg-Gotha and Schwarzburg-Sondershausen had equal and secret, but indirect suffrage. The Hanseatic cities and Württemburg used partly a universal, direct, and secret suffrage, partly a system based on other principles. Württemberg had a *scrutin de liste*, and Hamburg a form of proportional voting. Saxony and Oldenburg had systems of plural voting. The Prussian system of class voting was also in force in Waldeck, and, in a limited sense, in Brunswick and Saxe-Altenburg. In fact, almost every system of election was employed in one or the other of the German states in choosing the state Parliaments.

For the election of members of the Reichstag, the Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man Constitution, adopted at the time of the founding of the Empire, provided that the Election Law of May 31, 1869, should continue in force until modified, and further provided for the representation of the South German states. The distribution of seats was on the basis of one representative for each 100,000 population, fractions over 50,000 being likewise granted one representative. In deference to the federal principle each state was accorded at least one representative, even if the population was less than 100,000. In each electoral district a single representative was to be chosen by universal, equal, secret, and direct manhood suffrage, and by an absolute majority. In case no candidate obtained an absolute majority, a supplementary election was required at which only the two persons who received the highest number of votes at the first election could be candidates. These provisions were slightly amended in subsequent years, but only as to details.

The chief objection to the Law of 1869 lay not in the principles of election, but in the failure of the Government to redistrict the Empire from time to time. At the date of the enactment of the law the distribution of seats was fairly representative. But with the transformation of Germany from an agricultural into an industrial state, and the attendant movement of population from the rural districts to the cities, the Reichstag became less and less representative in character. Since 1871 the Empire increased in population by twenty-five millions, or sixty-six per cent. Of the annual increase ninety per cent. was in the large cities and centres of industry. Industrial Germany, representing two-thirds of the population, elected only two-fifths of the members of the Reichstag. In East Prussia there was one member to each 121,433 of the population; in Saxony one to each 208,804 of the population; in Westphalia, one to 242,700. Teltow, with 338,798 voters, and some of the rural districts, with less than 12,000 voters, had equal representation. A redistricting of the Empire was frequently proposed by the liberal parties, but without result, until shortly before the revolution.

Both the Social Democrats and the Progressive People's party demanded proportional voting. Had such a plan been adopted for the election of 1912—the last one held under the old law—it would have resulted in a substantial liberal majority. Out of the 12,206,808 votes cast, the Social Democrats obtained 4,250,329, or nearly thirty-five per cent., and would have been entitled, if elections had been held on a general ticket, to 138 out of 397 members, instead of 110; the National Liberals, with a total vote of 1,672,619, would have had a representation of fifty-four members, instead of forty-three; the Progressives, with 1,528,886 votes, would have had fifty members, instead of forty-three; while the representation of the Catholic Centre would have been reduced from ninety-two to sixty-six, and the combined representation of the Conservatives and of the Empire party would have been forty-nine instead of fifty-eight.

The Social Democrats, and to a lesser degree the other liberal parties, also objected to the requirement of an absolute majority. In practice this necessitated a second election in a large number of cases—as high as forty-eight per cent. in 1898—and was frequently used as a means of defeating the Social Democratic candidates.

"Rotten boroughs" in the conservative rural districts, single election districts, and the requirement of an absolute majority, all contributed toward maintaining the reactionary and conservative groups in power. The demand for reform in state as well as national election laws constantly became stronger, reaching a crisis in 1916 and 1917. Prussia promised a reform of its state laws, and other states had reforms under consideration.

On February 16, 1918, the Bundesrat approved a new law for national elections, which was ultimately adopted by the Reichstag, and signed on August 24, 1918 (*Official Gazette*, August 30, 1918). The number of members of the Reichstag was increased to 441, substantially on the basis of one representative for each 200,000 of the population, but with due regard to the principle that each state should have at least one representative. A number of districts were combined and given from two to ten representatives. Berlin was given ten in place of six representatives; Teltow, seven; Leipzig, four; Munich, Dresden, and Breslau, three each. All the additional representation went to the cities and industrial centres, but the small rural districts retained their old representation. Where more than one member was to be elected, the principle of proportional voting was adopted, with the further provision that in case of death, incapacity, or resignation of a member from such district the candidate who had received the highest number of votes among the defeated candidates succeeded to the vacancy. This law was to govern the elections to the next Reichstag. Had it been applied it would undoubtedly have resulted in a large liberal majority and in an increase of the Social Democratic representation.

Then followed the revolution. The election to the Assembly of Delegates convoked for December 16 was held under the terms of a proclamation of November 23, amended November 30 and December 6, providing for an election by universal, secret, and direct suffrage of citizens over twenty years of age, and on the basis of proportional representation. On November 30, 1918 (*Official Gazette*, December 2, 1918, and *Bulletin of Laws*, 1918, p. 1345) a new Imperial election law was enacted, entitled "An Ordinance concerning the Elections to the German National Constitutional Assembly," which is the one under which the elections to the Weimar Assembly were held. The total number of delegates to the Assembly was fixed at 433, which includes twelve allotted to Alsace-Lorraine. The distribution of seats is made on the basis of one delegate for each 150,000 inhabitants according to the census of 1910. When the territorial limits of a state or of an administrative district require consideration, an excess of at least 75,000 inhabitants is reckoned as the equivalent of the full 150,000.

The members are elected by general, direct, and secret suffrage, according to the principle of proportional voting, every German man or woman who has completed his twentieth year on the day of election being entitled to one vote. By an ordinance of January 7, 1919, the franchise was extended so as to include citizens of the German Austrian Republic domiciled in Germany. Persons belonging to the military class may vote and may participate in political meetings. Only citizens who are under curatorship or who have been deprived of civil rights by a judgment that has become definitive are excluded from voting. All persons entitled to vote are eligible to office if they have been German citizens for at least one year.

A list of voters is prepared for each election precinct, in which the names of the qualified voters there residing are entered. Such lists are open to public inspection at designated times. The right to vote may be exercised only in the election precinct in which the voter is listed. Nomina-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions must be signed by at least 100 persons entitled to vote within the precinct, and may not contain more names than there are delegates to be elected in the district. The written consent of the candidate must be attached.

Several nominations may be combined, and are then regarded as a single nomination. The ballots must be filled in in writing or by some process of manifolding with the names of the candidates for whom the voter desires to vote, and may be taken from only one of the publicly announced nominations. The ballot slip is then placed in an envelope, sealed, and put into the election urn by the voter, who, at the same time gives his name to the election board, which checks it on the list of voters. A voter may cast his vote for not more than the number of representatives to be elected, but he must take all of the names from the same party list, being prohibited from splitting his vote among candidates of different sets of nominations.

For the purpose of determining the result of an election, the committee on elections in each district determines the total number of valid votes cast and the total number for each party or combined parties. For the distribution of seats the votes cast for the several parties are successively divided by 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc., until a unit is found small enough to be contained in the party votes as many times as there are candidates to be elected. If the last highest number applies equally to several sets of nominations, the election is determined by lot. In case of combined party nominations, the ticket is regarded as a single one and the apportionment made accordingly. If a nomination or combined nomination contains a fewer number of candidates than the total candidates to be elected, any surplus is allotted to the other nominations.

Candidates who are elected must declare their acceptance within one week. The election was originally set for February 16, 1919. By an Ordinance of December 21, 1918, the date for the elections was changed to January 19, 1919, upon which date they were held.

Under date of December 21, 1918, the Prussian Government promulgated an ordinance concerning the elections to the Prussian State Constitutional Assembly. The form of election and the qualifications of electors are the same as in the national law. The representation is on the basis of one delegate for each 100,000 of the population except that regard must be had to existing administrative districts; any excess of 50,000 or more entitles the district to an additional representative.

The total number of delegates to be elected is 401. The entire state is divided into twenty-three election districts, each electing from eleven to twenty-four delegates according to population. Some of the larger districts and their representation are the following: City of Berlin, twenty-one; Province of East Prussia, twenty-one; Province of Posen, twenty-one; Governmental District of Oppeln, twenty-two; Governmental District of Arnsberg, twenty-four; Province of Hesse-Nassau, twenty-two. The elections under this ordinance took place on January 26, 1919, the voting lists for the national elections serving as the basis for the Prussian elections.

The draft constitution presented by the National Government for consideration by the Weimar convention provides for the adoption of the principles of the law of November 30, 1918, for national elections, and requires that elections to state legislative bodies be held on the same basis.

The Future of the World

By F. G. NICOLAI

THE following is the larger part of an article by Prof. F. G. Nicolai, of Berlin University, originally published in *Politiken* (Copenhagen) on December 1. As the result of his criticism of his fellow-scholars for their attitude in defending the war, Prof. Nicolai was interned early in the war in Gaudenz Fortress, where he wrote "Die Biologie des Krieges," recently published in translation in the United States. A year ago he made his escape to Denmark by aeroplane.

To the question, what is the future of the world, a man can give three answers: he can say what he knows, or at least what he believes, about the future; he can say what he hopes; and finally he can say what he fears. . . . The modern world possesses possibilities of a common life in freedom and fraternity. There is always a prospect that the world *will* achieve what it *can* achieve. This applies to states as it applies to individuals.

A new freedom and a new fraternity are in the world. But, unfortunately, as August Comte once pointed out, the new times have taken over a heritage from the old. Just now the most convinced adherents of the new era are trying to establish justice with the help of the old weapons of force. The sovereignty of force of individual states is to be strengthened by means of a world organization, and the excess of power of individual persons is to be limited by a progressive socialization. It has been forgotten that it was in order to establish justice between states that this cruel war was begun. And now in order to establish a system of justice, the proletariat is arming itself in the belief that it will realize its dreams by means of a dictatorship of force.

State agglomerations are in reality purely accidental combinations which have attained their importance only by the power of suggestion after centuries of propaganda. As an instance of this it will be recalled that early in the war all Germans declared that the cession of Alsace-Lorraine was a matter that could not even be discussed; to-day no importance at all is attached to the question. Does not that indicate with all necessary clearness that people, as so often happens, have confused the unessential with the essential? I was not, therefore, wrong when in 1914 I described the world war as a war of cannons against cannons. It was nothing else.

But now is beginning a much more serious struggle—the struggle as to what the individual has a right to possess. In this game is staked the whole of our former culture; for every one of us, even the most convinced communist, is intimately concerned with the question of the right to private property. The struggle, therefore, no longer involves indifferent questions of prestige; it involves deeply human principles.

This serious struggle, like all others, should be fought out only by means of intellectual weapons. The misfortune is that the struggle has begun at a moment when all the nations of the earth stand under arms. As a result, the danger arises that dead weapons will once more gain a victory over ideas. For this the former rulers must bear a large share of the responsibility; for it is no accident that developments have taken this course. In 1795 the Imperial Court of Vienna, fearing the threatening predominance of France, asked Berlin if it would not be well as a precaution to introduce universal service. The Prussian Government rejected the suggestion with the argument that such an armed power might develop into a peril to the existing order. Ten years later, however, Prussia was obliged to reconcile herself to the idea of raising a national army; and in the course of the following hundred years the national vanity of the masses increased so greatly that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government, now free from fear or suspicion, was able to put the whole nation under arms. To-day people are awakening from that century-long dream; to-day universal service is avenging itself in a way that its creators could hardly have foreseen. The people, who formerly merely forged (and paid for) arms, have become accustomed to using them; and now, when nationalistic tendencies have disappeared, they will use them in their own way. The people have learned to understand the armed man's superiority over the unarmed. Formerly the masses stood against power. To-day the masses are united with power. That this struggle for the socialization of society will continue; that it will spread to all men and all nations in ever-widening, irresistible circles—so much I believe I *know* about the future.

What I *hope* is that a healthy and understanding idealism will awaken in the nations, and with it the conviction that a struggle of force will not in the end lead to the goal; because mass dictatorship will at last lead to individual dictatorship. It is quite true that the Robespierre's ideas of freedom also influenced Napoleon; but nevertheless Napoleon was a round-about road to freedom. The nations, I hope, will realize that freedom and equality are not to be attained by relying upon mere brutal force; but that they are to be attained by the carrying on of a class struggle such as the proletariat used to carry on, that is, by disseminating the new ideas for the re-creation of society by means of agitation and discussion.

What I *fear* is that the proletariat, in the delirium of victory, will commit the same blunders as the former rulers; that, incited by the first brilliant results, it will forget the lesson of the war that the sword is a foolish support, and that it will set to work to make world history with machine-guns, as the Bolsheviki are already attempting in certain countries. . . .

Concerning the practical consequences of this, I must add a few words. To carry on politics means to foresee the future correctly and adapt oneself accordingly. Once it is realized that a struggle for the world's socialization has begun, and that it must continue to the bitter end, then it becomes the duty of the capable and far-seeing man not to let himself be misled by any personal advantage of the former world order, but to do his best to seize time by the forelock and to act as necessity commands.

In countries where revolution is already raging that is not possible. During a revolution the holders of power always make the mistake of bowing to the inevitable so late that no one will believe that the concessions are voluntary. Scheidemann was called too late to a Ministerial post; the Kaiser abdicated too late; Haase should have come sooner, and so should the proclamation of the republic. It was also a mistake that Liebknecht was not put in a responsible position. When, in view of his undoubted popularity, I demanded this a month ago, even the radicals thought the plan too radical, but now most of them will admit that this method of providing for the future was the right one, for in a responsible position Liebknecht would undoubtedly have acted differently and with more circumspection than he is acting now. In countries in a state of revolution it is impossible to make concessions, because there is nothing more to concede. It is the people who then rule and act. . . .

But in the rest of the world something may yet be done. If any country—even the smallest—in recognition of the inevitable, took measures in generous manner for the new ordering and re-creation of society, that country would not only spare itself a violent revolution, it would also render the whole world an inestimable service. If once the proletariat saw that a social revolution could take place without bloodshed and military dictatorship, no man thereafter would be foolish enough to resort to such methods. A peaceful revolution, even in an out-of-the-way corner of the world, may be able to save the world. For it must be clear to every thinking man that what is now coming will threaten the world's higher culture more seriously than even a four-years' war. I believe that a peaceful revolution can take place, but it must take place immediately; to-morrow will probably be too late. . . .

Thanks to its political foresight, England has so far escaped revolutions; and this country (Denmark) has also recently been in advance of its time and has decided on wide-reaching reforms. But I do not believe any longer in reforms. Revolution must come; not the revolution which is put through by force, but ordered revolution fought with spiritual weapons.

The world can be saved if even one nation understands the message of the time. Is there such a nation? . . .

During the whole of the terrible world war I have been an optimist in this regard, but now I have become a pessimist. The domination of the individual is not dangerous; the individual can always be overcome. It is only the domination of the masses which no one can overthrow.

Documents

A German Pacifist Manifesto

THE following proclamation of the "Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft," issued after the signing of the armistice, is taken from *Words of Reason*, a press bulletin published at Berne.

The conditions of the armistice, which have been forced on the German nation, have made the blood freeze in our veins, the fate which stares us in the face seems so terrible. Even should the worst that threatens us be unfulfilled, still the conditions themselves mock at any hope of intrinsic reconciliation in the future.

Such demands might have been justified against our former rulers, who, even if not alone, were responsible for the war, and who, when the war began, confident of their final victory, threatened the enemy Powers with the establishment of a German despotism. The demands should be dropped, however, when directed against the new Germany which has freed itself from its rulers and has placed at its head the most outspoken opponents of the broken-down military, monarchical system. The new Government should and must claim to be treated on a basis of mutual confidence, instead of allowing Germany to be first rendered so defenceless that it is forced to accept any peace which its enemies see fit to dictate.

We German pacifists have, during the entire war, through all the changes in the fortunes of war, and even at the time of the most brilliant German victories, opposed any German war aim which was prejudicial to the free self-disposal of any nation, or which could have injured its vital interests. At the same time we have demanded that the war should be ended by the creation of a league of nations, which, resting on the union of free nations, would protect equally the interests of all its members, effect universal disarmament, and guarantee lasting peace by the settlement of all international disputes by means other than war. We stood for this under the most difficult circumstances and in spite of suspicion and persecutions.

By this course we have earned the right to address the rulers in enemy countries, carrying our heads high and claiming from them that they grant to the German people that which we tirelessly demanded from the German nation and its Government for all our enemies. With particular urgency we appeal to all those in enemy and neutral countries who during the war (chiefly, perhaps, when the military preponderance seemed to be on the German side) stood for the idea of justice, for the right of nations to dispose of their own fate, for supernatural organization, and for a peace ensured by right, and who proclaimed this—often with the point turned against Germany—as the sole aim for which they were fighting. We do not approach them as suppliants, but demand that they now keep their word.

The most prominent and most powerful among them is President Wilson. We will not give up hope that he will hold to the repeatedly and solemnly pronounced programme to which his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political honor irrevocably binds him, that he desires to apply it justly and fairly to the concrete questions of the conclusion of peace, and that, with the help of the pacifist groups in the Allied countries, he will be able to carry out his will.

Our hope is not founded upon a presupposition of magnanimous impulses. As pacifists, labelled Utopian, we have long ceased to reckon with such factors. We appeal solely to the true and lasting interests of the victors. We repeat to them what we have so often said emphatically to our own countrymen during the war. A real peace, the setting up of a new and lasting peace encircling the whole world and guaranteeing justice, is possible only if no nation is violated in its vital interests and in its right of self-disposal. A humiliated and distracted German people, doomed to a miserable economic existence, would be a continual menace to the world's peace, as surely as a German people protected in its inalienable rights and conditions of life would be a strong support.

May those who to-day have the power, look beyond the immediate present to the future of mankind. An enormous responsibility rests on them. To-day something entirely new can be created for the blessing of all the nations, while short-sighted misuse of present power can spoil everything.

A French Tribute

THE following resolution addressed to the "Editors of the *Red Flag*, Berlin," was published in the *Populaire* (Paris) of January 26.

The Committee for the Defense of International Socialism desires with most sorrowful emotion to honor the heroic death of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, martyrs of the cause of labor and Socialism.

The proletariat of the world mourns the loss of these two great champions of the liberation of the exploited masses for whom they lived and for whom they died. The workers will forever venerate the memory of these fighters in the German revolution, as they do the memory of the fighters of the Russian revolutions, the Paris commune, and all proletarian movements. Their sacrifice will stimulate the energy of the international working class which will carry on with more zeal than ever its efforts for the social revolution.

Signed: JEAN LONGUET, MISTRAL, MAYERAS, FROSSARD, PAUL FAURE, VERFEUIL, MAURIN, SOUVARINE, MARTHE, BIGOT, AMEDEE DUNOIS, DANIEL RENOULT, MOURET, GRANDVALLET, REBERSAT, DUPONT, LAVIGNE, SERVANTIER, GOURDEAUX, RAZINE, MILLERAT.

The editors of the *Populaire* join in this resolution.

Czernin and the Austrian Collapse

THE following letter, written on April 12, 1917, by Count Czernin, at that time Austrian Foreign Minister, to Emperor Charles, was published in the Frankfurter *Zeitung* of December 18, 1918. Short extracts and summaries have also appeared in the press of the United States.

Will Your Majesty allow me to develop, with the frankness which has been permitted to me since the first day of my nomination, my responsible opinion of the situation. It is entirely clear that our military strength is approaching its end. To give full details on this point would be to waste the time of Your Majesty.

I merely refer to the approaching exhaustion of raw material for manufacture of munitions, to the entirely exhausted supply of human material, and above all to the dull despair which, primarily as the result of under-nourishment, has taken possession of all classes of the population and which makes impossible any further endurance of the sufferings of war. Even while I hope that we shall succeed in holding out during the coming months and in conducting a successful defensive, I am nevertheless absolutely convinced that another winter campaign is entirely impossible; in other words, that in the late summer or autumn we must finish things at any price. In this situation undoubtedly the most important thing is to begin peace negotiations at a moment when the enemy is not yet fully conscious of our decaying strength. If we approach the Entente at a moment when events within the Empire make visible the impending collapse, then every step will be in vain, and the Entente will consider no conditions except those which involve the complete annihilation of the Central Powers. To begin in good time is therefore of cardinal importance.

Here, however painful it is, I cannot ignore a question upon which the emphasis of my whole argument depends. That is the danger of revolution which is rising on the horizon of all Europe, and which is supported by England and is her newest weapon. In this war five monarchs have been dethroned; and the surprising ease with which the strongest monarchy in the world has now been overthrown may induce reflection and recall the phrase, *exempla trahunt*. It is no use replying that in Germany or Austria-Hungary conditions are different; it is no use replying that the firm roots of the monarchical idea in Berlin or Vienna preclude such an event. This war has opened a new era of world history; it has had no precedents and no prologues. The world is not the same as it was three years ago, and it is useless to seek in history analogies for all those events which are now everyday occurrences.

The statesman who is not blind nor deaf must notice that the dull despair of the nation is increasing daily; he must hear the low murmuring which comes from the broad masses; and he must, if he feels his responsibility, reckon with this factor. Your Majesty knows the contents of the secret reports of the *Statthalter*. Two things are clear: the Russian Revolution is having greater effect upon our Slavs than upon Germans of the German Empire; and responsibility for the continuance of the war is far more dangerous for a monarch whose country is united only by dynastic bonds, than in a country in which the people are fighting for their own national independence. Your Majesty knows that the burden upon the people has grown to dimensions which are simply unbearable. Your Majesty knows that the bow is stretched so taut that a break may be expected any day. If serious disorders occur either here or in Germany, it will be impossible to conceal the fact from foreign countries; and from that moment all further efforts to obtain peace will be unsuccessful. I do not believe that the internal condition of Germany is materially different from ours, but I fear that in military circles at Berlin certain illusions are cherished. I have the firm conviction that Germany, like ourselves, is at the end of its strength, as indeed the responsible political elements in Berlin do not deny. I am as firm as a rock in the conviction that if Germany attempts to conduct another winter campaign, there will result convulsions in the interior of the Empire which would seem to me much worse than a bad peace concluded by the monarchs. If the monarchs of the Central Powers are not able to conclude peace in the coming months, the peoples will conclude it over their heads; and then the wave of revolutionary events will sweep away all those things for which our brothers and sons are still fighting and dying.

I shall certainly not here make any *oratio pro domo;* but I beg Your Majesty to remember graciously that when I alone two years ago predicted the Rumanian war, I preached to deaf ears; and when, two months before the outbreak of war, I prophesied almost the day on which it would begin, I found no credence. I am just as convinced in my present diagnosis as I was then, and I cannot repeat with too much emphasis that we should not hold lightly the dangers which I see growing and growing.

It is beyond doubt that the American declaration of war has materially aggravated the situation. It may be that months will pass before America can throw any forces worth mentioning into the theatre of war; but the moral factor, the fact that the Entente now expects new and powerful aid, alters the situation to our disadvantage, because our enemies have considerably more time before them than we, and can wait longer than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we, unluckily, can wait. What direction Russian events will take cannot now be said. I hope, and that is the pivot of my whole argument, that Russia has lost her offensive power for a long time, if not for ever; and that this important factor can be turned to advantage. Nevertheless I expect that a Franco-English, probably also an Italian, offensive is immediately impending, and I hope that we shall succeed in repelling both of these attacks. Once this has happened—and I calculate that it may happen in two or three months—then, before America again changes the military situation to our disadvantage, we must make a more far-reaching, detailed peace proposal, and in this not shrink from great and serious sacrifices.

In Germany great hope is based upon the submarine war. I consider this hope delusive. I do not deny for a moment the fabulous achievements of the sea heroes; I concede with admiration that the number of ships sunk monthly is something incredible; but I affirm that the success awaited and predicted by the Germans has not been achieved. Your Majesty will remember that, during his last visit to Vienna, Admiral Holtzendorff positively predicted that the intensified submarine war would finish England within six months. Your Majesty will further remember that we opposed all these predictions and declared that while we did not indeed doubt that the submarine warfare would injure England, the success expected would be paralyzed by the foreseen entry of America into the war. It is now two and a half months (that is, nearly half the term mentioned) since the beginning of the submarine war, and all the news we have from England agrees that we should not even think of a collapse of this most powerful and dangerous of our enemies. When Your Majesty, despite serious doubts, agreed to the German wish and allowed the Austro-Hungarian navy to participate in the submarine war, this was not because we were converted by Germany's arguments, but because Your Majesty considered it absolutely necessary to act in accord with Germany in all fields; and because we were convinced that Germany could not be swerved from her determination, once it was arrived at, to begin the intensified submarine war. But to-day even enthusiastic German advocates of submarine warfare must begin to realize that this means will not decide the victory; and I hope that the unfortunately mistaken notion that England will be forced to conclude peace within a few months will also lose ground in Berlin. Nothing in politics is more dangerous than believing what you wish; nothing is more fatal than the principle of closing one's eyes to the truth, and giving oneself up to Utopian illusions, from which there must sooner or later be a fearful awakening.

England, the driving force in the war, will not within the space of a few months be forced to lay down her arms; but probably—and here I concede that the submarine war has had a limited success—probably in a few months England will ask herself whether it is wise and reasonable to fight this war *à outrance*, whether it would not be more statesmanlike to step upon a golden bridge if such a bridge is built by the Central Powers. Then the moment would come for far-reaching, painful sacrifices on the part of the Central Powers.

Your Majesty has, under my responsibility, rejected the repeated efforts of our enemies to separate us from our allies, because Your Majesty is not capable of dishonorable conduct. But at the same time Your Majesty commissioned me to say to the allied statesmen of the German Empire that we are at the end of our strength and that Germany cannot count on us longer than the late summer. I executed these orders, and the German statesmen left me no doubt that for Germany also another winter campaign is an impossibility. In this one sentence lies, indeed, all that I have to say: we can yet wait a few weeks longer and see whether opportunities present themselves for conversing with Paris or Petrograd. If this does not succeed then we must in good time play our last cards and make the extreme proposals which I earlier indicated.

Your Majesty has given sufficient proof that you do not think egoistically and do not require from the German ally any sacrifice which Your Majesty is not ready to make yourself. More than that no one can demand. Before God and your peoples, however, Your Majesty has the duty of doing everything in your power to prevent the catastrophe of a collapse of the Monarchy; before God and your peoples Your Majesty has the sacred duty of defending your peoples, the dynastic principle, and your throne with all means and to the last breath.

With profound respect: CZERNIN

Vienna, April 12, 1917

Proclamation of the Hungarian Republic

A BUDAPEST letter of November 16 to the New York *Volkszeitung*, gives the details of the proclamation of the Hungarian Republic, which during the excitement of the week following the signing of the armistice received comparatively little notice. Following the formal dissolution of the House of Representatives and the House of Magnates, a meeting of the Hungarian National Council took place. Members of the Honved of 1848 in their ancient uniforms had seats of honor on the platform. Johann Hock, president of the National Council, in a strongly pro-Ally speech, declared that Hungary, oppressed first by the Holy Roman Empire, and then by the modern German Empire, was the traditional ally of the Western peoples. The proclamation of the Republic was then unanimously adopted.

The Hungarian National Council has adopted, by the will of the people, the following popular resolve:

Article I. Hungary is a people's republic independent of all other countries.

Article II. The constitution of the people's republic will be determined by a constituent national assembly, the convocation of which, on the basis of the new electoral law, is a pressing necessity. The House of Representatives and the House of Magnates of the Hungarian Parliament have been dissolved and no longer exist.

Article III. Until the constituent national assembly decides otherwise the supreme power of the state is exercised by the people's Government acting under President Michael Karolyi with the support of the executive committee of the Hungarian National Council.

Article IV. The people's Government must establish much needed laws regarding (1) universal, secret, equal, direct suffrage, including women, in the National Assembly, in the counties, and communes; (2) freedom of the press; (3) popular trial by jury; (4) freedom of association and assembly; (5) the distribution of land among the agricultural population.

The people's Government must bring these laws into existence and execute them.

Article V. Legal provisions inconsistent with the above are void. All other legal provisions remain in force.

JOHANN HOCK, President of the National Council

Budapest, November 16, 1918

The New Insurance Law of Russia

ONE of the most important decrees issued by the Soviet Government of Russia was the "Law of the Insurance Council," the text of which follows.

1. The Insurance Council is instituted under the People's Commissary of Labor for the supervision of all matters relating to the insurance of workmen.

2. The Insurance Council consists of 24 members from the insured, four from the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, two each from the All-Russian Central Council of factory and mill committees and agricultural laborers' com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittees, three from the People's Commissariat of Labor, one from the People's Commissariat of Justice, eight from employers, and one each from Zemstvo and municipal self-governments, from physicians, and from lawyers.

3. The Insurance Council elects from its number a chairman, two vice-chairmen, and two secretaries.

4. The members of the Council from the People's Commissariats are appointed by order of the respective People's Commissaries.

5. The period of incumbency of the elected members of the Council is fixed at one year.

6. The members of the Council from Zemstvo and city self-governments, and from physicians and lawyers, are elected, respectively, by the main head committees of the All-Russian Zemstvo Union and Union of Cities, by the directorate of the Society of Russian Physicians in memory of N. I. Pirogoff, and by the All-Russian Association of Lawyers.

7. The members of the Council from insurance funds are elected in accordance with the rules established by the all-Russian conventions of members of the funds assembled in accordance with Article 27 of this law.

8. The members of the Council from the All-Russian Trades Council and All-Russian Central Council of factory and mill committees and agricultural laborers' committees are elected at the respective all-Russian conventions.

9. The members of the Council from employers are elected by the central employers' associations by their mutual consent.

10. Persons of either sex may be elected as members of the Council from insurance funds, trade unions, factory, mill, and agricultural laborers' committees, and also from employers, even if they are not members of insurance funds, trade union, factory, mill, and agricultural laborers' committees, or employers' associations.

11. As substitutes for the members of the Council there are elected 12 from the insured, 2 from the All-Russian Central Council of Trades Unions, 1 each from the All-Russian Central Council of the factory, mill, and agricultural laborers' committees, 4 from employers, and 1 each from municipal and Zemstvo self-governments, physicians and lawyers, according to Articles 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The substitution of members is made in the order of the majority of votes received in the election, and, in case of an equal number of votes, by drawing lots. The substitutes may participate at the sessions of the Council, even if the membership is complete, but in the latter case only with the right of a consulting vote.

12. The members of the Council by election and their substitutes, upon the expiration of the time of their incumbency, continue to perform their duties until new elections. Retiring members may be reëlected.

13. Members of the Council receive, for their participation in the labors of the Council, remuneration from the funds of the state treasury, the amount of which is fixed by the statutes of the Council. The amount of remuneration of the substitutes is fixed by the instructions of the Council.

14. The absence of members of the Council from the insurance funds, trade unions, factory, mill, and agricultural laborers' committees, from work or office at the time when they are engaged in the performance of the duties devolving upon them as members of the Council does not give the employer the right to impose upon them fines for absence from work (Industrial Labor law, edition of 1913, articles 104 and 106) or to demand the cancellation of the employment contract.

15. To the sessions of the Council may be invited persons from whom it may be expected to obtain useful information about the matter under discussion. When considering matters which concern the jurisdiction of the people's commissariats which have no representatives on the Council, such persons are invited by arrangement with the respective People's Commissary. Invited persons enjoy the right of a consulting vote.

16. The direction of the business of the Insurance Council devolves upon the bureau of the Council, which is elected by the general assembly of the Council. The sessions of the Council are called by the bureau whenever necessary. Matters are submitted for the consideration of the Council in the order established by the bureau of the Council. Members of the Council have the right to submit through the bureau, for consideration by the Council, questions which relate to matters in its jurisdiction.

17. The Insurance Council has jurisdiction in the following cases:

(a) the issuance, within the limits of the laws in force, of regulations and instructions concerning all kinds of workmen's insurance, as well as the issuance of rules establishing the order of operation of local insurance institutions in charge of these matters;

(b) the examination of objections which may arise from the application by the local insurance institutions of the laws governing questions of workmen's insurance;

(c) the annulment of the decisions of insurance boards against which, by law, appeals may be taken to the Council;

(d) the consideration of complaints against the decisions of the insurance boards submitted to the Insurance Council;

(e) the fixing of the amount of remuneration of members of the insurance boards for participation in the labors of these boards;

(f) the issuance of rules governing the accounting of insurance funds and other insurance institutions;

(g) the establishment of a general rule for the application of the insurance laws to persons who work in coöperative societies, artisans, those engaged in home industries, and poor peasants who work independently without employing hired labor;

(h) consideration of legislative proposals regarding matters of workmen's insurance, instructions to sections, and the general assembly of the Council;

(i) proposals regarding the inspection of local institutions in charge of insurance, and also the inspection of insurance funds and other insurance institutions;

(j) the consideration of questions having relation to matters within the jurisdiction of the Council and submitted by the People's Commissariat of Labor, as well as by members of the Council through the bureau of the Council.

The Insurance Council has jurisdiction in the following cases in particular:

I. Regarding workmen's insurance against sickness:

(a) the establishment of the form and order of furnishing proper information by employers, as well as the keeping of books and records containing this information, and the order of their submission for examination;

(b) the fixing of time limits for the establishment of hospital funds;

(c) the issuance of regulations governing the equipment and maintenance of medical institutions for members of hospital funds, as well as the extent of medical aid in all its forms;

(d) the establishment of the order and general basis of rendering medical aid to members of hospital funds;

(e) the establishment of the forms of medical reports of institutions which treat members of hospital funds;

(f) the establishment of the form of annual reports about the employment of hospital funds.

II. Regarding workmen's insurance against accidents:

(a) the establishment of the form of certificate attesting the circumstances under which the accident occurred;

(b) the establishment of time limits for the issuance to pensioners of certificates necessary for receiving a pension;

(c) the establishment of the form of pension books and rules governing their issuance;

(d) the establishment of regulations and the time limit for the delivery of information about the nature of an enterprise and the number of persons employed in it;

(e) the approval of tables for reckoning the capitalized cost of pensions;

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(f) the consideration of the basis for calculating the proportions of the insurance contributions of employers;

(g) the establishment and determination of the classes of dangerous occupations;

(h) the selection of the forms of statistical reports about accidents.

III. Regarding workmen's insurance against unemployment:

(a) the fixing of the amount of the contribution of employers to the unemployment fund in its ratio to wages;

(b) the establishment of rules of deposit, keeping and disbursement of the all-Russian unemployment fund;

(c) the establishment of the form of the order on which employers shall furnish necessary information;

(d) the examination of complaints against the decisions of insurance boards.

19. The Insurance Council transacts its business in general sessions and in separate sections of the Council.

20. Separate sections are established by the Council for the consideration of questions and business (a) of insurance against sickness, (b) accident insurance, (c) unemployment insurance, (d) old age insurance, etc.

21. The personnel of the sections, the order of their election, and the apportionment of business among the sections is determined by the Council in special instructions for each section.

22. The decisions of the Council are final. The People's Commissary of Labor is given the right of vetoing the decisions of the Council.

23. The general assembly of the Council may order the formation of committees to carry out special missions of the Council or sections, and persons who are not members of the Council may be included in those committees.

24. When the inspection is being made, as stipulated in clause *i* of Article 17 of this law, institutions and persons are obliged to produce all books, accounts and records which have reference to the object of the inspection.

25. The rules of procedure in the general assembly, sections and committees, as well as in the bureau of the Council, are determined by instructions formulated by the Council.

26. The decisions of the Council are published in a special collection which is sent free to local insurance institutions and insurance organizations, as well as governmental and public institutions and organizations, at the discretion of the bureau of the Council. Decisions having a binding character are published for general information in the central organ of the Government.

27. For the consideration of the most important measures of a general character which relate to workmen's insurance, all-Russian and regional conventions of insured are called annually.

Note: The order of elections to the conventions is determined by local workmen's insurance organizations.

28. The business of the Insurance Council is to be transacted by the department of social insurance of the People's Commissariat of Labor, under the direction of the bureau of the Council.

29. Until the election of the members of the Insurance Council from members of insurance funds in the way provided by Article 7 of this law, the above members of the Council are elected at the Petrograd workmen's insurance conference on the basis of one delegate to 1,000 workmen.

The members of the Insurance Council from employers, until their election in the way indicated in Article 9 of this law, are elected by the Petrograd association of manufacturers.

Complaints against election errors are lodged with the People's Commissariat of Labor.

Signed:

People's Commissary of Labor,
A. SHLIAPNIKOFF

Director of the Department of Social Insurance,
A. VINOKUROFF

Secretary of the Department,
A. PODERIN

November 29, 1917

Regulation of Prices in Russia

THE following decree, published by the Soviet Government on January 30, 1918, creates "committees on prices" invested with wide powers over the source, price, and distribution of all varieties of commodities.

1. Although the shops in the large cities have not received any goods during the last few months, and all the articles in them were purchased earlier by the proprietors at comparatively low prices, nevertheless at the present time the proprietors demand for these goods prices much higher than those which prevailed four months ago. Accordingly an examination of all books of all shops in all cities and settlements with a population of not less than 10,000 is ordered.

2. In view of the obvious necessity of control over the fixing of prices, committees on prices are created for every class of commercial establishment (dry-goods, haberdashery, hardware, groceries, etc.).

3. The determination of those branches of commerce for each of which a special committee on prices is created is left to a commission of representatives of the local Soviet of Workmen's Deputies, the city council, and the union of commercial-industrial employees in equal numbers (three each from those organizations).

4. The same commission determines which commercial establishments are within the jurisdiction of each committee on prices.

5. Committees on prices, in accordance with this ordinance, are to be created without fail in every city and settlement with a population not less than 10,000.

6. The members of the committee on prices comprise 2 representatives of the respective section of commercial-industrial employees, 2 representatives of consumers' leagues, 2 representatives of proprietors of the respective commercial establishments, 1 statistician, and 1 book-keeper, chosen by the local Soviet of Workmen's Deputies.

7. The committee on prices controls a given branch of commerce in its entirety and directs it on the following principles:

(a) the verification of the disbursements of the commercial establishment for the acquisition, keeping and organization of the sale of goods, and additional expenses connected with the conduct of the business;

(b) the determination, on this basis, of the normal average price of each product for a given city;

(c) the fixing of an average amount of profit;

(d) the apportionment of the profit among all the shops, with the right of taking as a whole all disbursements and all incomes of all shops of a given branch of commerce in a given city, but so calculated that all proprietors who are personally engaged in their business, and their families, shall be secured at least a suitable maintenance.

8. The committee on prices controls the sources of supply of shops for articles in which they deal, and takes measures for the uninterrupted delivery to the shops of those articles in proper quantities, and in extreme cases, at the expense of the proprietors, making necessary expenditures and organizing the temporary management of those shops whose proprietors cease trading or who maliciously do not take proper measures for securing the supply of goods for the shop, or who violate the rules of the committee.

9. For the unification of the supply of goods to shops, the committee on prices assumes the duty of a purchasing centre which supplies all stores under its control; while the proprietors, for that purpose, place at its disposal all their connections, knowledge, and technical and administrative apparatus, and supply such funds as they ordinarily disburse for supplying their shops with goods. The committee on prices has the right to organize purchasing centres, and may increase, in case of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessity, the representation of the proprietors of shops on the committee to four members instead of two.

10. The committee on prices sees to it that the shops under its control carry out all regulations of the authorities regarding the distribution of products among the population whether by cards or on some other basis.

11. The committee on prices of each city elects representatives to the all-city committee on prices, which coördinates the activity of separate committees under the direction of the central, regional, and local boards of national economy, and in accordance with their regulations.

12. For the expense connected with the business of the committees on prices and the maintenance of their personnel, a deduction from the profits of the commercial establishments under their control is made in suitable proportions and by their order.

13. Executive authority for carrying out this ordinance in each city, including the formation of a commission provided for in Clause 3, is given to local trade unions of commercial-industrial employees, and, in case of the absence of such, to the local Soviet of Workmen's Deputies; or, in the absence of such Soviet to the city council, or, in case of the absence of such city council, to the local consumers' leagues.

14. This ordinance shall be put into effect not later than the month of February. Persons guilty of its violation are liable to imprisonment for a period not longer than one year, and to a fine at the discretion of the Revolutionary Tribunal.

Decree Abolishing Classes and Civil Ranks

THE following Russian decree was confirmed by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies on November 10, 1917.

1. All classes and class divisions of citizens, class privileges and disabilities, class organizations and institutions which have until now existed in Russia, as well as all civil ranks, are abolished.

2. All designations (as merchant, nobleman, burgher, peasant, etc.), titles (as Prince, Count, etc.), and distinctions of civil ranks (Privy, State, and other Councillors), are abolished, and one common designation is established for all the population of Russia—citizen of the Russian Republic.

3. The properties of the noblemen's class institutions are hereby transferred to corresponding Zemstvo self-governing bodies.

4. The properties of merchants' and burghers' associations are hereby placed at the disposal of corresponding municipal bodies.

5. All class institutions, transactions and archives are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of corresponding municipal and Zemstvo bodies.

6. All corresponding clauses of the laws which have existed until now are abolished.

7. This decree becomes effective from the day of its publication, and is to be immediately put into effect, by the local Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies.

Contributors to This Issue

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON, formerly of the Foreign Press Bureau of the Committee on Public Information, is now on the staff of the Foreign Press Service in New York, and is a member of the Royal Commission of Venice.

CHARLES HENRY HUBERICH is an international lawyer in New York.

RICHARD KING is a London solicitor, and the editor of *International Law Notes*.

Foreign Press

Free Trade as the Basis of Peace

THE English historian, W. Alison Phillips, writing in the *New Europe* (London) of December 5 on "The Price of the Society of Nations," thinks that such a society, when it is established, will not exist long without universal free trade.

That the memory of this war will for a long time to come incline the majority of men to peace, I believe. That to secure this peace some sort of league of nations will be necessary is universally admitted. The only difference of opinion, but it is a fundamental one, is as to the nature of this league. Everyone desires the growth of a friendlier spirit and a freer intercourse between nations, but opinions differ as to the means by which these desirable ends shall be best attained. I do not believe that they will be attained by any attempt to unite the nations, differing as they do in interests, in temperament, and in ideas, by artificial bands. Generally speaking, the looser the legal ties which bind people together the less likely they are to quarrel; for what human nature, individual and collective, most resents is the sense of constraint. The British Empire, as General Smuts has insisted, has flourished and remained united precisely because of its loose organization, and it may be doubted whether it would long survive any attempt to give it the character of an organized state. The same is in a far greater degree true of the society of nations. Its only trustworthy principle of cohesion would be a vivid sense of community of interest, and the only final proof of the existence of such a sense would be the throwing down of the economic barriers between its constituent groups. The mere delimitation of boundaries on national lines will not effect the desired end, for every frontier line drawn is in its essence a declaration of war, and nothing in this will be altered by the fact that the last word in the to be or not to be of war will be spoken in the councils of the league, in which interest and opinions on the questions at issue may be violently divided. In short, I agree with the Belgian writer, M. Lambert, in holding that, without universal free trade, "the Grand Supernational Council will have more need of peace than peace will have of the Grand Supernational Council."

A British Plea for Disarmament

THE provisions of the Constitution of the league of nations as adopted at Paris lend interest to the following discussion of the question of disarmament by G. Lowes Dickinson. The article appeared in the first issue (January) of the *League of Nations Journal and Monthly Report* published by the League of Nations Union of Great Britain.

There is one truth which ought to become the basis of all efforts to abolish war. It is this. The principal cause of war is preparation for war. The fact that this should appear to most people, even now, to be not a truism but a paradox, shows how slow the obvious is to penetrate men's minds. Only the other day M. Clemenceau gave proof that he had learned nothing from the war and what led up to it by reaffirming his belief in the "balance of power," and then (of course) interpreting it as meaning the opposite of a balance, that is, a predominance of power in the hands of the liberal Powers. That, in fact, is what the balance has always meant. Every weight in it, so to speak, constantly striving to increase itself so that it may weigh the balance down. That is the root of the competition in armaments. The competition then breeds mistrust and fear. Every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state or group of states says it is arming for "defence." The rival state or group believes the contrary. It becomes at last a question not whether there should be a war, but who should begin it at the advantageous moment. There need hardly be even a show of cause of dispute; there never is an adequate cause for war. The war arises in order that some state or other may not, at some other time, be attacked at a greater disadvantage. All this is as plain as two and two is four. Yet it is prevented from reaching men's minds by the long habit of being armed. Unless they had a preponderating fleet the British would not feel safe. And that, although there might be no rival fleet to threaten them. So with the continental nations and their armies. A disarmed frontier looks to them like suicide. Yet for a hundred years in North America 6,000 miles of frontier between the United States and Canada have been unguarded, and nobody has felt insecure. Why? Just because the frontier was unguarded, so that neither party had to fear an attack. For that reason, mainly, the many acute disputes between the United States and Canada or the United Kingdom have not led to war. Palpably armaments are the cause of war.

Now, in fact, as this war has ended, there is no reason why all states should not disarm by land and sea. The militarist autocracies are smashed to pieces. The liberal democracies, by their own professions, could not contemplate making an aggressive war. There is therefore no one left to make such a war. But a defensive war is impossible if there is no offensive war.

Disarm, and of necessity all disputes are settled by other means than war. Disarm, and the principal difficulty in the way of a league of nations, mutual fear and suspicion, vanishes. Disarm, and permanent peace is guaranteed, so far as anything can be guaranteed in this world.

Why then is disarmament, complete all-round disarmament, not the thing peoples are demanding and statesmen preparing? Simply and solely because of the inertia of bad habit. There are, no doubt, subsidiary reasons—professional militarism and navalism, armament firms, and all the interests that fatten on war, that live on human flesh and blood. But these could not resist a real popular demand for disarmament. The demand is not there, because the knowledge and the thought is not there. Peoples say that they want permanent peace, but they will not sacrifice to it the least of their prejudices nor the thousandth part of their time and trouble. The world will therefore continue armed. And so continuing, will increase a thousand fold the difficulty of preserving peace.

Punishing the Kaiser

SIR HERBERT STEPHEN, one of the authors of a standard "Digest of the Law of Criminal Procedure in Indictable Offences," writing in the London *Times* (December 18) in criticism of the views expressed by J. Holland Rose, the English historian, regarding the trial of the Kaiser, says:

"No one," Dr. Holland Rose tells us, "suggests that Wilhelm should be condemned untried." He cannot have read the newspapers attentively. Only last week a candidate for Parliament is reported to have suggested that the Kaiser should be tried by a jury of matrons, half of whom were to be the widows of men drowned in the Lusitania and the other half the mothers of girls deported from Belgium or France into Germany. Would this be a trial or a mock trial? To talk about a fair trial and "evidence" in this connection is really nonsense. When Charles I. had his fair trial, witnesses were procured to swear that they had seen him riding on a horse, and apparently in command of his armies, at Edgehill and Marston Moor, and had seen men killed in the Parliamentary armies. Does Dr. Holland Rose wish that farce to be repeated? We are at war with the Kaiser; his person is within our reach; we might have made his surrender a condition of the armistice, and I do not know why we did not; but, however much some of us may wish it, we cannot give him any trial but a mock trial. We cannot give him an impartial tribunal. Most of us would not consent to any "trial" of which the result was not a foregone conclusion. A mock trial is a prostitution of justice. It is the use of the forms of peaceful justice when the facts constituting the foundation of peaceful justice are absent. It is not honest, and it can never produce any good result.

It does not in the least follow that because it is impossible to "try" the Kaiser it is impossible to punish him. All the electors and candidates who are so fully determined on his punishment can easily have their way. It is an act of war like another, and the King's advisers, acting in concert with his friends, should be well able to decide what form it should take. At the same time there is something to be said for Lord Halifax's view that the offences, or wicked acts, committed by the Germans are national, not individual, offences and should be nationally, not individually, punished. Suppose we take the lives of the Kaiser and a few scores, or even hundreds, of his fellow-countrymen. We shall thereby to some extent appease our resentment, as Mr. J. S. Phillpotts, basing himself on Bishop Butler, has phrased it, for the unspeakable atrocities that have been committed. The vindictive motive, the desire for revenge, which most writers on ethics seem to wish to deny, forms an important part of the foundation of all penal arrangements, and ought to be substantially gratified. But the question remains whether the punishment of a few individuals will really satisfy it best. If we punish individuals we shall necessarily to some extent accept their fate in expiation of the wrong that has been done, and to that extent we shall mitigate the punishment of the German nation as a whole. I wish to make all Germans feel to the utmost, and lament to the utmost, the wickedness of their collective deeds. In so far as the punishment of individuals will abate the deserved suffering of the mass, I am inclined to begrudge it. This side of the question ought by no means to be neglected by those whose duty it is to gather in detail the fruits of our victory.

Canada and the West Indies

A CORRESPONDENT of the Vancouver *Daily Province* urges serious consideration of the proposal to annex the British West Indies to Canada. The question has been discussed of late in several Canadian newspapers.

The suggestion to include among matters for discussion at the peace conference a proposed transfer of the British West Indies to Canada is worth a little more consideration from the people of British Columbia than that suggested by the morning paper, viz., that the proposal should be thrown in the waste paper basket. These islands if brought within the Canadian confederation would be of considerable value, and the expressed fear that a negro population is not desirable is hardly worthy of its author. The inhabitants of the West Indies are quite different from the negro population of the southern United States, as any one who has been to both parts can testify. Sex crimes are practically unknown in the West Indies, the most common crimes being petty larceny, mainly resulting from low wages.

Prior to the war the inhabitants were gradually coming to look upon the United States as their natural market, and every effort has been made by the Americans to capture the West Indian trade. In spite of this, Canada and Great Britain have secured a large share, but during the war much of it has been lost. There is a good market for lumber, flour, and salt fish, but these are now mainly supplied from the United States.

When Canadian Government vessels commence to ply between Halifax and Vancouver, the value of Kingston will become apparent and an excellent trade could be worked up between these ports. If Kingston were a Canadian port it would be an important half-way point between the Pacific and Atlantic ports.

Apart from trade considerations, the West Indies are yearly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becoming more important from a tourist point of view, and at times the United States has shown a desire to get all West Indian islands away from European control. She could have no objection, however, to Canada owning a score of them. If the islands are to pass out of control of Great Britain, is Canada content in order to evade responsibility to see them become part of the United States?

In conclusion I may add that the two principal banks of Jamaica are the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Royal Bank of Canada, and these banks must see good business for them or they would not be there to-day.

French Economic Interest in Russia

THE following plea for the study of Russia and the Russian language with a view to the renewal of economic relations between Russia and France is contributed to *L'Homme Libre* (Paris) by Ernest Pezet.

It is perhaps neither useless nor inopportune to recall that Russia, once the chosen land of bureaucratic tyranny, is not now solely the country of Bolshevism. As long as the Bolshevist terror lasts commerce, industry, and agriculture cannot prosper in Russia, and the movement of trade expansion toward this country will be, if not absolutely arrested, at least very uncertain. But everything has an end, even Bolshevism. Lenine and his zealots are in process of ruining Russia's finances and business; nevertheless they have not impoverished the wealth of her subsoil nor ruined the fertility of her plains. Russia keeps her riches; her means of exchange and production remain unaltered. So we have still the same good reasons for preparing our economic activity in that country. Our interest demands it. Are we giving it any practical thought?

On October 4, 1916, M. Lucien Poincaré, then Director of Higher Education, declared to the Franco-Russian Committee in Paris that it was a prime necessity to organize instruction in Russian, not only in the *lycées* but in the upper primary schools.

On the other hand, the Franco-Russian Committee was at that time planning to send to Russia young men possessing, as a preliminary, at least one year of linguistic and commercial education, in order to facilitate their placement.

Our English allies, whose practical spirit and thought for the future we must praise and emulate, have undertaken to inaugurate the teaching of Russian in their country. Thanks, indeed, to the initiative of the British Government, thanks to the gifts of more than one rich Mæcenas and of persons of importance in the world of commerce and industry, the English universities will have—and some of them already have—their chairs of Russian. Manchester, Birmingham, Eton, Cheltenham, etc., have classes in Russian, and Russian is also made a part of the commercial courses of the City of London.

Organizations such as the Bradford Dyers' Association have decided to send young Englishmen to Russia, and scholarships have been awarded to young people with an elementary knowledge of Russian. A bureau of commercial information has been organized at Glasgow.

"We are endeavoring," said Sir [George] Buchanan recently, "to bring Russia and England nearer together commercially and economically. Our desire is to help that country to put its natural resources into use and to develop its industry."

Since 1916 an Anglo-Russian office has been attached to the English Embassy in Petrograd. It was a sort of propaganda and press bureau which offered to everyone authorized information regarding England, her institutions, universities, chambers of commerce, etc.

Is it not time for us, too, in spite of Bolshevism, to be thinking of organizing a firm and lasting connection between France and Russia? Our public authorities, our higher commercial schools, our chambers of commerce (that of Paris in particular), our manufacturers and merchants, who are the most immediately interested, are they busying themselves with preparing for French commerce and industry, against the time when peace shall be concluded, representatives capable of counterbalancing the efforts of the Austro-Germans who will be desirous of regaining their influence over the industrial and commercial world of Russia?

The study and operation of the many and fruitful undertakings which, as soon as the war ends, will inevitably be inaugurated in Russia—forestry, means of communication, mines, factories, etc.—will require a host of agents to serve as connecting links between France and Russia. Are we, like England, preparing them? Shall we have them? It does not seem so. Who among us knows Russian? And who teaches it? We raise a hue and cry—properly, of course—against the Bolshevists, and that is all. Yet the commercial future of France in Russia and in the Slav countries depends on not allowing herself to be outdistanced in the work necessary to prepare young people to enter actively so vast a field of industrial and commercial expansion. This would be, in addition, the best way to penetrate and transform morally that tormented country, as well as to preserve it from new forms of Bolshevism—after it has rid itself of that which is now devastating it.

Freedom of the Press in France

THE extent to which the press of France is still subject to censorship regulations is revealed in the following article by Paul Faure in the *Populaire* (Paris) of January 10. It is interesting to note that the Spartacan manifesto, to the proletariat of the world, mentioned in the third paragraph, appeared in the *Populaire* of the following day, January 11.

Day by day the French bourgeois papers write the history of the German revolution as they wrote and are still writing that of the Russian revolution. It is easy to imagine in what good faith and how fairly. Naïve persons sometimes write to us, "You are right in denouncing false or partisan news. But why do you not publish the true news?" Dear readers, have you heard of the censorship? It is of two varieties. In the first place, the news that the agencies give us, for pay, is scrutinized, viséd, and emasculated, for these agencies are not merely news agencies, but capitalist news agencies. Consequently what reaches us is commonly incomplete and, on account of its source, open to suspicion. Secondly, what we may publish is subject to a censorship, the existence and exploits of which M. Clemenceau condemned at the time when he was not Minister, but which he was quick to maintain in action as soon as he had the power.

There remains our special correspondence. Here, also, there are two methods used. Our letters are opened at the frontier, and many of them, doubtless, disappear *en route*, according either to the whims of "abbés à la Cochin" or to the orders that they receive. As for the few which escape rifling, the censorship takes care that we do not make use of them.

Thus no later than yesterday we wanted to publish a manifesto addressed to the proletariat of the world by the Spartacus group. Not a line, not a word, not even the title found mercy; not even a characteristic passage in which the authors (Liebknecht, Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Franz Mehring) denounced German militarism. The *Lanterne* is not alone in preferring Hindenburg to Liebknecht.

Under these conditions no one, I imagine, will reproach the *Populaire* with being silent at times and with displaying an occasional timidity of expression which is absolutely indispensable if we desire to make heard a minimum of protest against the dirty work of reaction that the capitalist Governments have already undertaken, or are considering undertaking, and against the odious régime of suppression of thought to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which those are subjected who do not consider perfect the world that is being prepared for us.

Yet when countries with a population of hundreds of millions, like Germany, Austria, and Russia, are in the midst of a revolutionary crisis, it is intolerable to be kept in complete ignorance of events which cannot be indifferent to the peoples, since these events will press with all their weight on the future of all humanity and may modify from bottom to top the relations of men and of nations to one another, and, according to the course that they take, may bring to pass the great ideal of peace and liberty or may strengthen the forces of violence and oppression.

It is intolerable that public opinion should be "enlightened" only by adulterated information and by the interested comments of the controlling classes. That is, doubtless, to the interest of the bourgeoisie, internationally and nationally desirous of crushing labor revolutions and of rousing hatred among different peoples. We note the fact without surprise. But we emphasize it, we return to it repeatedly in order to make our comrades fully understand what efforts they must keep up to make Socialism more vigorous, to give it more resistance in face of the formidable wave of reaction which is breaking upon us and which threatens to crush the mighty movement which has caused a rising of the masses in the countries of Europe.

The Political Programme of Hungary

THE political programme of the Hungarian President, Count Karolyi, at that time Prime Minister, was enunciated by him at a general meeting held at Budapest on December 23. The following report of his address appeared in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*.

Karolyi began by declaring that even before the outbreak of the conflict he was convinced that the war, frivolously begun by diplomats, could only injure Hungary even in case of victory. At the present time, also, he had confidence in the victory of pacifism, which must come to prevail in all countries of the world. He was especially convinced that the American people, erroneously called a nation of shopkeepers but in reality rather an idealistic people, would not permit the fourteen points of its President to be deprived of their essential meaning, his pacifist ideals to be brought to nothing, and the war to end in a Brest-Litovsk peace. Let the leaders among the old ruling class atone, but let there be no punishment of the peoples, who suffered in the war but never willed it. The Allies must make a peace which should exclude humiliation, since the embitterment of a humiliated people must some time break out and lead to a new war.

"We concluded the Belgrade peace under hard conditions, yet we required the guarantee that no *fait accompli* should be created before the peace conference, and that the administration of the entire territory of Hungary should remain in the hands of the Hungarian Government. The armistice agreement was nevertheless not observed. The line of demarkation up to which foreign troops might advance was fixed by compulsion, and even if we accept it we will never recognize it is just. The agreement provides that since demarkation lines are not tariff lines, trade shall be undisturbed. The opposite has occurred. If I had ever dreamed that this agreement would be so falsely interpreted I should never in the world have signed it. I state openly that if they go on in this way, not only will it be impossible to maintain order, but the necessary requirements of the country in foodstuffs and coal cannot be satisfied. We will protest against these injustices until other peoples also hear. But anarchy recognizes no national boundaries and spreads like wildfire. The leading men of the Entente allow themselves to be guided in all their thoughts by the fear of anarchy. But at the same time they fail to prevent conditions which are themselves the breeding ground of anarchy. I believe that at last they, too, will understand that things cannot go on much longer as they are going. I have this confidence especially now when Wilson is in Europe, for I know that such injustice cannot be harmonized with his point of view.

"To my mind the real solution would be to maintain the necessary order until the peace conference and seek to establish with our neighbors the trade which is absolutely necessary. If we should realize a Danube federation on the Swiss model we could then create an economic whole without disturbing the natural economic boundaries within which each nation would have its full political freedom; and, along with economic unity, unity of aims in external politics would also be maintained. In this way the territorial unity of Hungary could be preserved economically without in the least imperilling the natural development of states concerned."

The Prime Minister then sketched in outline his programme of domestic politics. He accepts the theory of private property but believes that its sanctity cannot be so absolute as in old Roman law. He would bring about great reforms in the field not only of real property but of other capital. Reform of landed property is a pressing necessity in order that those returning from the front may be able to get land. As for the elections, the Government will do all in its power to see that they are held just as soon as possible. He considered it very important that elections should be held in the occupied districts also. As long as he should remain in office his policy would have three main pillars—the independence of Hungary, democracy, and the realization of social institutions.

After great applause the bourgeois parties expressed their agreement and the assembly adopted a proposal for the creation of a strong bourgeois party for social and democratic progress. On motion of President Hock it also voted to send the following dispatch to President Wilson: "Hungary relies on the sacred federation of peoples. With sincere enthusiasm it accepts all of Wilson's peace points through which the world-redeeming order of freedom, justice, and love of mankind may come freely to prevail. Hungary, however, expects this even from those who, in spite of the armistice agreement, have attacked her by force to take from her everything that has economic and moral value. It is possible to kill, not only with weapons, but also by deprivation of the necessities of life. We await with confidence the settlements to be made by the chosen apostle of eternal peace and humanity, the leader of free America, Woodrow Wilson."

The Price of Victory

THE following comments on the results of Allied victory appeared recently in the Vienna *Arbeiterzeitung*.

Until a few weeks ago Germany was still the stronghold of reaction in the world. In the midst of democratic nations on the west and east, the German nation was governed by its Ludendorffs and oppressed by the most outrageous militarism. Its victorious arms threatened the freedom of all the neighboring nations. Germany fell upon Belgium, devastated France, plundered Poland and the Ukraine, and enslaved Czechs and South-Slavs with dungeon and gallows. Germany's victory over the Entente would have been the victory of militarism over democracy, of monarchy over republic, the autocratic state over the popular state. To uphold Germany meant at that time upholding reaction in Europe.

But the mighty November storm has changed everything. In Berlin as in Munich, in Vienna as in Hamburg, the revolution has conquered. Austria is destroyed, Prussia is fallen, the dynasties have been driven out, militarism is shattered; but the German people remain and are prepared to determine their fate for themselves in perfect freedom. The rôles are now changed: Germany and German-Austria are creating freer constitutions to-day than England, France, or Italy possess; and while the German people claim only their own right of self-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disposal, no longer threatening the freedom of any foreign state, Allied imperialism tramples upon German rights, as a few months ago German imperialism crushed the rights of foreign nations. The imperialism of the Allies now threatens to march into Germany, just as a few months ago German imperialism marched into Russia, Finland, and the Ukraine. The imperialism of the Allies wishes now to subject Alsace and Western Prussia, German Bohemia, and Southern Tyrol to foreign rule, just as a few months ago German imperialism wished to subject Courland, Livonia, Belgium, and Lorraine to foreign rule. Allied imperialism now denies to German Austria the right of uniting itself to Germany, just as, a few months since, German imperialism refused Poland, Southern Slavonia, and Rumania the right of national unity. Allied imperialism now plays the rôle which, until lately, was played by German imperialism.

Defeat has always—so the history of three centuries teaches us—broken the strength of the rulers in the conquered land and brought democracy into power; victory has always—as may be read in a hundred pages of history—strengthened reaction. When the Entente seemed beaten, democracy was strong in the Allied countries. Germany and Austria might then have had an honorable peace of mutual understanding. They disdained it, for we then pursued a peace of victory. Now it is too late; the Entente has conquered. Its victory, it is true, has brought democracy into power in Central Europe, but at the same time it has broken the strength of democracy in the Allied countries. As conquerors, Lloyd George and Clemenceau are all powerful, for the exultation of victory holds the mass of the people under its spell. In vain the French, English, and Italian Socialists protest against the peace of force which the imperialism of the Allies, drunk with victory, seeks to impose upon the German people, they are powerless against Entente imperialism, as we were powerless against German imperialism at the time of Brest-Litovsk. Even Wilson, who dictated his will even a few months ago to the Entente, can do nothing to-day against the Ludendorffs of Paris and London, since Germany is so enfeebled that London and Paris no longer require Wilson's help against Germany. Entente imperialism is the conqueror to-day. It tramples on the democratic principles which itself inscribed on its banners, so long as it had to unchain the forces of democracy for its purposes. It is to-day prepared to mock at the rights of self-determination of the nations, just as Kühlmann and Czernin mocked at them at Brest-Litovsk, and to impose a peace of force on the German nation, such as the Central Powers imposed on Russia and Rumania.

Japan and the League of Nations

THE *Bulletin* (December 23) of the Japan Society of New York quotes the Tokio *Kokumin* as saying editorially:

Undoubtedly, the chief object of the league of nations is to attain the permanent peace of the world. This is now the universal wish of all mankind, for although there have been many wars in the past, yet no war has brought such misery as the present.

Judging from this, it is virtually safe to say that the league of nations will be the inevitable outcome of this war. No nation opposes the general principle expressed by President Wilson. If Japan is really desirous of remaining one of the leading Powers of the world after the war, she should determine to take an active part in this noble movement. We say this not only for her sake, but for the sake of Asia.

When we take up the question, we find a number of practical problems must be solved before a perfect union of all nations is effected. The most important problem, which Japan is especially interested in, is that relating to the conflict of races. A league of nations which does not guarantee equal opportunity and equal treatment for all races and nationalities is by no means perfect. If the American President is really desirous of making his plan successful, he should have courage to abolish all the laws and regulations of his country which discriminate against races other than white. Is President Wilson determined to do this? Japan has the right to ask him for a definite answer.

Secondly, the problem relating to the reduction of armaments is certainly one of the most important as well as the most difficult questions to be solved at the coming peace conference. The Powers of Europe and America may disperse their armies when the war is over, and their huge guns and tanks may be converted into machinery. But have they the determination to carry out the reduction of their great navies?

If they demand of Japan to dissolve her great army, while maintaining their naval forces entirely untouched, Japan has no reason to obey their dictation. Certainly, we do not insist on the present military system of Japan. The war has taught us that it is unnecessary to maintain a huge standing army in the days of peace.

Sir Richard Dane in China

A SHANGHAI dispatch of November 29, printed in the London *Times*, gives the following appreciative account of the work of Sir Richard Morris Dane in China. Previous to his appointment, in 1913, as Foreign Chief Inspector of the Salt Revenue in China, Sir Richard had served for many years as an official in India.

It is five and a half years since he arrived to undertake the organizing of the salt gabelle under the terms of the reorganization loan of April 26, 1913, and the success of the system which he constructed has not only satisfied every need of the loan, but has produced an annual surplus which rapidly became the mainstay of the Government. Before Sir Richard Dane took a hand the revenue derived from salt by Peking was not exactly known. The best estimate, that of Sir Alexander Hosie, was about 26,000,000 taels—say $35,000,000. For the third completed year of Sir Richard Dane's administration it yielded $72,000,000, of which, after the service of the loan, a surplus of $52,000,000 remained to the Government. But for civil strife and the sequestration of the salt revenues by the southwestern provinces, they would probably have produced by now $100,000,000; and in the estimation of some good judges the amount would have been considerably higher.

The merit of this achievement is enhanced by the enormous difficulties which Sir Richard Dane had to overcome. At the outset the machinery of Peking for the control and collection of revenue was hopelessly inadequate. In Sir Richard Dane's own words, he had hardly ink to write with or paper to write on. Sir Richard Dane travelled from one end of the country to the other, and, despite ancient vested interests, gradually succeeded in breaking down the monopolies, coördinating all the systems, instituting a single tax at the place of origin, and thereafter permitting salt to travel free. It is not the least remarkable feature of the gabelle that it employs but 46 foreigners, and many districts are wholly in the hands of Chinese without the faintest detriment, thus completely upsetting all traditional beliefs as to the impossibility of expecting the honest administration of public funds from the Chinese uncontrolled.

Sir Richard Dane is very emphatic on the ability of the Chinese to manage their own affairs subject to little advice. The success which he attained was largely due to the confidence and sympathy which he at all times evinced towards the Chinese. A leading Chinese official said recently that there were only three foreigners who ever really impressed the Chinese—Sir Robert Hart, General Gordon, and Sir Richard Dane, and it is safe to add that none was ever held in higher esteem by them than Sir Richard Dane.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

THE press of the Nonconformist churches of Great Britain, which before the war was substantially united in its support of the Liberal party, is now sharply divided on political issues. Of the two leading organs of the English Free Churches, the *British Weekly* ardently fought for the Coalition cause during the election campaign, while the *Christian World* as vigorously opposed it. The former paper went so far as to begin an editorial on "The Hero as Statesman" with the sentence: "Cromwell, Chatham and Lloyd George are three statesmen who have made Britain great." The *Christian World* has attacked the Administration for its "dangerous delays," particularly in regard to problems of demobilization and reconstruction and the release of conscientious objectors. Another interesting factor in the situation is the recent acquisition of the leading organ of Liberal Methodism, the *Methodist Times*, by a group of younger ministers and laymen, most of whom advocated the cause of the Labor party at the general election.

MUCH interest has been aroused in France by the announcement that the trial of Raoul Villain, who assassinated Jean-Louis Jaurès on August 1, 1914, has been finally set for March 24. At that date Villain will have already been under "preventive detention" for four years and eight months.

SINCE the visit of President Wilson to Italy a wide-spread campaign to propagate his views has been undertaken by the Italian League of Free Nations Society, (Famiglia Italiana della Lega Universale per la Società tra le Libere Nazione). A series of meetings and public lectures has been arranged in all the principal cities of Italy and the provinces to educate the people in "the great idealistic ideas of Wilson" and to "promote a vigorous movement in support of a peace founded on right and justice." The campaign opened with a public meeting at Milan on January 12 at which ex-Minister Bissolati was announced as speaker.

THE ancient Spanish University of Salmanca has sent a message to President Wilson greeting him as the champion of peace, and inquiring whether he would consider it opportune for the university to ask permission to be present at the peace conference, either alone or with other Spanish, neutral, or American universities, with a view to writing the history of the work of the conference.

OF interest as throwing a light on labor opinion in Switzerland was the decision arrived at by a special conference of the Swiss Metal and Watch Workers Union held at Berne to give qualified sanction to the use of the general strike. The union, previously committed to the position that the general strike was not a legitimate trade union weapon, reversed its attitude, on the ground that the general strike, favored by the war and the revolution, had come into common use. The conference limited its endorsement, however, by adopting the position that in a democracy the general strike should be utilized only as a last means of exerting pressure upon a reactionary majority. The conference defeated the proposal of the Zürich delegates to establish soldiers' and workers' councils in all parts of the country to lead the labor struggle.

THE question of Bulgarian atrocities has been made the subject of an investigation by the Bulgarian Government, according to an official announcement in the *Mir* of December 19. The announcement states that during the early period of the war the Bulgarian public, subjected to a "terroristic régime," was unable to raise its voice against the excesses which were injuring the good name of the country. Under the new régime, however, a commission had been appointed to investigate these acts and punish all offenders. The Government, while inviting conscientious complaints, at the same time "protests against the unjust calumnies which interested circles are heaping against Bulgaria, with the object of placing her in an invidious situation on the eve of the peace conference."

THE question of the status of the Monroe Doctrine under the provisions of the league of nations is being actively discussed in the press of Brazil. The adoption of an all-inclusive international statute would, according to a considerable body of opinion, render useless the present method of protecting the sovereignty of the South American republics, which implies a special grouping of interests incompatible with the idea and spirit of the league. The contrary view, that the league of nations will serve simply to fortify the authority of the Monroe Doctrine, has had a certain amount of support.

A NEW political party, "the Independence Association," has recently been formed in Porto Rico to agitate for the complete separation of the island from the control of the United States. The official organ of the party is *La Correspondencia*. In connection with the growth of separatist agitation, a correspondent of the New York *Evening Post* reports that a letter has been received by the dean of the University of Porto Rico from Dr. Paul G. Miller, Commissioner of Education, "requesting a list of the names of the members of the graduating class of the Normal School who had signed the petition to the House of Representatives urging that a certain resolution to the President of the United States be changed so as to pray for the complete independence of Porto Rico." The Commissioner further stated that no appointments as teachers would be granted to any applicants whose loyalty to the United States might be questioned.

THE agreement of the Negro and native population of South Africa to refrain from political agitation for the duration of the war was formally renounced at a mass meeting of the colored citizens of Claremont called by the African Political Organization. An aggressive campaign of organization and agitation was determined upon with a view to combating discrimination against the colored people of the Union. A resolution supporting "any action the African Political Organization may take to obtain the deletion of the 'color bar' from the Act of Union" was unanimously adopted.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandivanian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED